A

TREATISE

Concerning the

COVENANT and BAPTISM

Dialogue-wise, between

a *BAPTIST* & a *POEDO-BAPTIST*,

Wherein is shewed,

That Believers only are the Spirituall Seed of *Abraham*; Fully discovering The Fallacy of the Argument drawn from the Birth Priviledge.

WITH

Some Animadversions upon a Book Intituled *Infant-Baptism from Heaven and not of men*, Defending the Practise of Baptizing only Believers against the Exceptions of M. *Whiston*.

By *Edward Hutchinson*.

Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ πρῶτον εἶτα τῷ βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίσασθαι· i.e. *It is necessary first to believe, and afterwards to be signed with Baptism.* Basil. *l.*3. *contra Eunom.*

I beseech you regard not what this or that man says, but enquire all things of the Scripture. Chrysost. 13. hom. 2 Cor.

If you be Christs, then are ye Abrahams *seed, and heirs according to the Promise.* Gal. 3. 29.

LONDON.

Printed, for *Francis Smith* at the Elephant and Castle, near the *Royall Exchange* in *Cornhil*. 1676.

43
4 6
417
1

The Epiſtle
DEDICATORY.

To the ſpiritual ſeed of Abraham *eſpecially thoſe of the* Baptized *Congregations.*

BEloved *for the fathers ſake, firſt premiſing, that they are not all* Iſrael, *that are of* Iſrael, *I know there is* droſſe *mingled with your* ſilver, chaff *amongſt your* wheat, *and the* Canaanite *is ſtill in the land, and troubles you: but to you that are indeed the true ſeed of* Abraham *by faith in* Jeſus Chriſt, *do I dedicate this Treatiſe. You beloved are of God, and have your fathers name written in your foreheads; you are the true* Iſraelites, *to whom pertaineth the* Adoption, *and the* glory, *the* Covenants *and Goſpel* promiſes; *whoſe are the fathers, and for whom Chriſt came, who is over all God bleſſed for ever. You are a choſen* generation, a Royal prieſthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, walking in the ſteps of your father Abraham, *hearkning to that great* Prophet *whom God hath raiſed up among your brethren, and have been* baptized into the name of the father, ſon, and holy ſpirit. *But the* devil (*that implacable enemy of ſouls*) *hath endeavoured to wreak his malice upon you above all people, opening his floodgates to overwhelm you; the* Archers *have ſhot ſorely at you, the* plowers *have made deep furrows upon your backs, yet you are ſtill ſupported by the* rock *of Ages, and ſtrengthned by an Everlaſting* Arm; *they have*

laboured in vain, for the blessings of your father Abraham *have prevailed above the blessings of your progenitors.*

Your begining in these nations (of late years) was but small; yet when it pleased the Lord to dispel those clouds that overshaddowed us, and scatter some beams of the Gospel amongst us, he gave you so great an increase that Sion *may say with admiration,* who hath begotten me these! *&c.*

Nor is it lesse observable that whereas other Reformations have been carryed on by the secular arm, *and the Countenance and allowance of the Magistrate, as in* Luthers *time by several* German *Princes; the* Protestant *Reformation in* England *by King* Edward, Q. Elizabeth, *&c. The* Presbyterian *reformation, by a* Parliament, Comittee of Estates, Assembly of Divines, *besides the favour and assistance of great personages; you have had none of these to take you by the hand, but your progresse was against the impetuous current of humane opposition, attended with such external discouragements as bespeak your embracing this despised truth, an effect of heart-sincerity, void of all mercenary considerations. Yea how active has the* Accuser *of the Brethren been to represent you in such frightful figures, exposing you by that mischievous artifice to popular* Odium, *and the lash of Magistracy; in so much that the name of an* Anabaptist *was crime enough: which doubtlesse was a heavy* obstacle *in the way of many pious souls.*

And what our dissenting brethren have to answer, upon that account (who instead of taking up, have laid stumbling blocks *in the way of Reformation)*

formation) *will appear another day. Yet notwithſtanding the ſtrenuous oppoſitions of thoſe great and learned ones, The mighty God of* Jacob *hath taken you by the hand, and ſaid* be ſtrong.

Beſides it has a conſiderable tendency to the advancement of divine grace, if we conſider the way and manner of the Reviving this coſtly truth. When the profeſſors of theſe Nations had been a long time wearied with the yoke of ſuperſtitious ceremonies, traditions of men, and corrupt mixtures in the worſhip and ſervice of God; *it pleaſed the Lord to break theſe yokes, and by a very ſtrong impulſe of his ſpirit upon the hearts of his people, to convince them of the neceſſity of Reformation. Divers pious and very gracious people having often ſought the Lord by faſting and prayer, that he would ſhew them the* patern of his houſe, *the goings out, and comeings in thereof*, &c. *Reſolved* (*by the grace of God*) not to receive or practiſe any piece of poſitive worſhip, which had not precept or Example from the word of God. *Infant-Baptiſm coming of courſe under conſideration, after long ſearch and many debates it was found to have no footing in the Scriptures* (the only rule and ſtandard to try doctrines by) *but on the contrary a meer innovation, yea the prophanation of an ordinance of God. And though it was purpoſed to be laid aſide, yet what fears, tremblings, and temptations did attend them leſt they ſhould be miſtaken, conſidering how many learned and Godly men were of an oppoſite perſwaſion; How gladly would they have had the reſt of their brethren gone along with them? But when there was no hopes, they concluded that* a Chriſtians

ans faith muſt not ſtand in the wiſdom of men, and that every one muſt give an account of himſelf to God, *and ſo reſolved to practiſe according to their light: The great objection was, the want of an* Adminiſtrator, *which (as I have heard) was removed by ſending certain meſſengers to* Holland *whence they were ſupplyed. So that this little cloud of Witneſſes, hath the Lord by his grace ſo greatly encreaſed, that it is ſpread over our Horizon, though oppoſed and contradicted by men of all ſorts.*

And now friends I can ſafely bear you record, that it is not humour, conceitedneſſe *or* ſingularity (*ſo often charged upon you*) *that makes you decline the Baptizing your little ones: For I know they are as dear to you, as children are to any parents under heaven; your ſighs and tears, thoſe heart-breaking deſires and pathetick wiſhes you ſend to the mercy-ſeat for them, is a ſufficient teſtimony hereof, and your petitions, that* Iſhmael *may live before God, that your children may be converted, that they may have an Intereſt in the new Covenant, that the law of God may be written in their hearts, that their ſins may be pardoned, their natures ſanctifyed, and their ſouls eternally ſaved. And did you know that Baptiſm could contribute the leaſt* iota *hereunto, how readily and zealouſly would you perform it? beſides it is an eaſy ſervice, that would bring you into the credit and eſteem of differing profeſſors, divers of your natural relations, &c. yea 'tis as ſafe, as eaſy, nothing of* ſelf-denyal *or the* Croſs *attending it. And it is very remarkable that many have ſuffered for owning moſt (if not all other) points of faith and Chriſtianity, yea divers have ſuffered e-*

ven

ven unto death for denying, yet none (that ever I heard of) ſuffered for owning Infants-Baptiſm.

Yet though your children are dear to you, the word of the Lord, and the purity of his worſhip is far more dear, and hence you dare not adde to his words leſt he reprove you, and you be found lyars. You dare not offer ſtrange fire *to the Lord, which he hath not commanded, nor prophane an Ordinance; you know that Baptiſm (being a part of inſtituted worſhip, not found in natures garden) has of it ſelf no vertue, but what it receives from the inſtitutor; For as one well obſerves* moral laws are good, and therefore commanded: but poſitive worſhip is commanded, and therefore good. *So that your adverſaries clamour without ground, and the Lord will judge between us. And if it be queſtioned why I inſiſt ſo much upon this ſubject? I anſwer, I was weary with forbearing when I ſaw your affliction, and beheld the reproaches, wherewith your opponents unmercifully perſecute you. But brethren as I have gone in and out among you theſe ſix and twenty years, ſo I have had opportunity to know thoſe pious ſouls among you,* whoſe Converſation is in Heaven, *who live above the Clouds, who groan under the* body of ſin, and remains of corruption, *I have known your manner of life, your* faith, patience, long-ſuffering, charity; *I have alſo ſeen your dark ſide, and obſerv'd your infirmities (which your adverſaries view through a multiplying glaſs; But if there be any ſociety or Community of people that differ from you, that have not their dark ſide,* let them caſt the firſt ſtone. *Yet you dare not allow the leaſt ſin in you; your prayers and endeavours ſ*

gre

greater meaſures of mortification, and that you may be ſanctified throughout, ſtand compleat in the whole will of God, and be filled with all the fruits of righteouſneſſe through Jeſus Chriſt, are famous inſtances that you are preſſing after perfection.

I know you do not deſire theſe Encomium's, *but I have the example of the holy ſpirit, whoſe ſteps I humbly conceive I may follow.* Rev. 2. 2. *where theſe Commendations are given of the Church,* I know thy works, thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canſt not bear them that are evil; and for my names ſake haſt laboured, and haſt not fainted, *&c. It's true the Lord knows theſe things in another manner then we do,* viz. *by ſearching the heart; we by outward obſervation: yet ſo far as we know we judge.*

And now what remains, but that you hold on your way, and grow ſtronger and ſtronger, being like that ſhining light, that ſhines more and more to the perfect day; dayly purging your ſelves from all filthyneſſe of fleſh and ſpirit, perfecting holyne[ſſe] the fear of God, walking in the ſteps of your f[ather] Abraham, *and in a little time you ſhall be received into his boſome, where the weary are at reſt, and the wicked ceaſe from troubling. And ſo I commend you to God and the good word of his grace, which is able to make you ſtand, and give you an inheritance among them that are ſanctifyed, and remain*

Your Soul-friend,

E. H.

To

To the READER.

Reader,

IT is a truth too plain to need Demonſtration, that the enemy of ſouls invaded the *Church* of *Chriſt* even in its very infancy, *privily bringing in Damnable Hereſies*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. That the *Scarlet whore drew away the Kings of the Earth, peoples, and Multitudes, and Nations, and tongues after her*, Rev. 17. *and made them drunk with the wine of her Fornications*. That the *man of ſin*, that *ſon of perdition*, 2 *Theſ.* 2. erected himſelf a Monarchy, and *ſate in the Temple of God*, maintaining that ſtation with *power*, and *ſignes*, and *lying wonders*. So ſpreading and epidemical were the Incantations of that Glittering ſtrumpet, that few eſcaped the temptations of her *Golden cup*. Now amongſt thoſe multitudes that wondred after the *Beaſt*, what kind entertainment could the ordinances of the meek and ſelf denying Jeſus have? *whoſe kingdom is not of this world*, *John.* 18. 36. On the contrary, we find the whole Fabrick, and Oeconomy of Goſpel worſhip ſhatter'd, ſubverted, and overthrown in moſt places where it was received; and the kingdom of darkneſs raiſed upon its ruines. What fundamental truth, what practical duty of Chriſtianity but was utterly exploded, or ſo metamorphos'd, that nothing of its original form and beauty was left? But when this *Myſtery of Iniquity* came to be gradually revealed; when the voice from heaven ſaid, *come out of her my people*, Rev. 18. 4. *when the woman was*

ſeen

ſeen drunk with the blond of the Saints, Rev. 17. 6. How was ſhe bewailed by thoſe that dealt in her wares! How have thoſe *Locuſts* of the bottomleſs pit peſter'd both ſea and land to gain her *proſelites*! making Reformation a hard task, purſuing it with bloud, perſecution, and maſſacre. Yet, maugre all the powers of Hell, truth gets ground, and the Lord with the brightneſſe of his coming, enlightens us more and more every day.

Yet ſtill it is very obſervable, that when [by quadrating them with the word of God, the only rule of faith and practiſe] any truths are recovered; or when thoſe carnal and traſhy ſuperficialls that deform and diſguiſe others, are flung away; Then ſome malevolent Agent of the grand Deceiver, improves his uttermoſt craft to obſcure and repreſent it in the moſt hideous and averting forms, and faſten the blackeſt calumnies upon ſuch as the Lord makes his Inſtruments of reformation. The ſon of God foretold this, *Math.* 5. 11. All ages ſince have confirmed it. Our Martyrologies have recorded thoſe worthies that *reſiſted unto blood, thoſe bleſſed ſouls under the Altar, that were ſlain for the word of God, and the Teſtimony which they held, to whom the white robes were given*, Rev. 6. 9, 11. whoſe blood will one day be avenged upon their Barbarous Aſſaſinates.

The ordinance of *Baptiſm* [that great and radical duty here contended for] hath been as groſly perverted, mangled, and abuſed as any Goſpel Inſtitution whatever, new matter, new form, nothing left but the bare name, and that

too

too wreſted, miſinterpreted, and forced to favour and bear ſymmetry with that Idle and frivolous *Pædo-rantiſm* ſet up in its room.

Nor need we wonder at the ſtiff oppoſition and harſh uſage the aſſertors of *Believers Baptiſm* have met with from time to time; the error they attaque being ſo neceſſary to the *Antichriſtian Monarchy*, that it is indeed the *Baſis* upon which that pompous, proud ſuperſtructure moves, from whoſe Pinacle, the man of ſin may caſt an Imperious glance and ſay with *Nebuchadnezar*, *Vah Babylon, Babylon proprio te robore ſerva*;

For, if a thorough reformation of this point be admitted; if Miniſters *teach firſt, then baptize ſuch only as profeſs faith in the Lord Jeſus, and newneſs of life evidenced by a holy converſation*, (that being the only practiſe warrantable by, and exemplyfied in the word of God) It will inevitably follow, that the Papal Monarchy (that great thing *Catechreſtically* call'd a Church) muſt vaniſh, and the large Revenues, pomp, and grandeur of its active Janizaries expire with it: ſince the matter of ſuch a ſynagogue is the collective body of the nations; which becauſe of its unbelief and prophaneſſe the word of God excludes out of the Church, till in Gods time and by his power gradually converted: it being evident from the mouth that errs not, that the greateſt part of Mankind traverſes the broad way to deſtruction, *Math.* 7. 13.

Surely this one conſideration has a more forcible rhetorick to keep up this pernicious practiſe, then all the juglings of its abettors, or the gaudy flouriſhes

flouriſhes or ſpecious *Fulcrums* its defenders produce to illuſtrate and ſupport it. It is one of the Popes political (and very neceſſary) maximes, [and I fear borrowed by many from him,] wanting that power by which the Goſpel miniſters acted, to principle the emiſſaries that manage his cauſe very ripely in ſchool-ſophiſtry, and ſuch other ſubtile qualifications, that their learned craft, and ſeeming profoundneſs of wiſdom and parts may amuſe and captivate the generality of mankind. And indeed we find them too apt to be gaping after thoſe ornaments, which the Apoſtle elegantly calls, Πειθοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, and well tranſlated, *the inticing words of mans wiſdom*; 1 *Cor.* 2. 4. They are well verſed in the perplexing Idle whimſies of *Ariſtotle*, *Scotus* &c. but meer dunces and fools in plain Scripture doctrines: their Heathen Philoſophy and the Goſpel being at as wide a diſtance, as the Earth is from the third Heaven. *See Job.* 5. 12, 13. *and* 32. 9. 1 *Cor.* 1. 19.

But what is moſt lamentable is, that miniſters that are ſeparatiſts from national corruption and prophaneſs, and (in the judgment of charity) in many things orthodox and pious, ſhould be the forwardeſt oppoſers of ſo neceſſary a reformation; and not only ſo, but when they find the pretences upon which it was (with a ridiculous retinue) obtruded upon the world rotten and reeling, they muſt invent new ſupporters for it, viz. *a Covenant right derivative from a believing parent &c.* As if ſpiritual graces would admit of carnal propagations, or that a Chriſtian doth always

ways beget a Christian, a divinity as novel as 'tis absurd. And with this modern auxiliary this otherwise yeelding cause is reinforced.

In the judgment of some it may perhaps add to the credit of that fancy that so famous a man as Mr. *Baxter* is, should patronize it. But he is not the first *Theological grandee* that has been mistaken. Performances of never so exalted a kind conferr not the priviledge of Infallible. 'Tis only the great Creator is unerring. A man may preach and write of the most seraphick verities, and yet know but in part; Mr *Baxter* is to be honoured as far as he has laid himself out to preach the Gospel, and improve his Talent for the Conversion of souls in this evil day; But when he forgets himself, and instead of promoting practical holyness, fills the nation with notions as uncertain as they are numberless, puzling such as arrive not to the subtilty of his distinction, creating more doubts then ever he'l be able to resolve, making Christianity a meer riddle which no man understands but he, and liable to as many forms and interpretations as his wavering mind: Then I humbly conceive he may be very safely left. Αφθις τα φανερα μη διωκε τα φανη, was a golden Aphorism of a heathen poet. Sure as peaceable as he would make us believe he is, that party or person that incurs his displeasure, must expect an unmerciful handling. He is so invenom'd an Antagonist, that whoever encounters him has need of an Antidote. Nor is his *reverend new Author* Mr. *Wills* (to whom he is so liberal of his encomiums) much behind in this Excellen-

cy: A ſtrenuous ſatyriſt that by the flaſhes of his *Academick* wit makes ſome blaze, little of ſolid heat or warmth.

As for Mr. *Baxter* it ſeems he has ſomething prophetical in him, he ſays in his laſt book, *he knows what can be ſaid in anſwer, and what he'l reply, and the others rejoynder &c.* Belike he knew by the ſame prophetick faculty *the firſt year of his miniſtry when he fell into doubts about Infants Baptiſm, and ſuſpended the practiſe ſome years*, as he ſays, that the *Anti-Pœdobaptiſts* would be out of the favour of the times, and ſo inconſiderable as he (ſcornfully) ſays they are, which ſcared the man to the other ſide: And to convince the world that he was re-proſelyted in good earneſt, perſecutes them with all the obloquy and ſlaunder, a virulent peeviſh humor could dictate. So that, poor people! 'tis well their bones are whole from the furious artillery and cruſhing graſps of ſo mighty a *Polyphemus*.

It would ſtartle a man to ſee what a room he would take up, as if the whole world muſt become his pupil! How confident a dictator he is to univerſal mankind! ſuch a reconciler, that he will not be ſtopt in his cariere till he brings us to *Rome*, as if the vaſt creation muſt be of his pariſh! But I doubt the Pope will not be ſo tamely cog'd to reſign up to Mr. *Baxter* his *Regalia Petri*. Sure as nimble a *Proteus* as he is, hee'l find himſelf miſtaken in theſe incongruous Topicks. We have the *Bible* in Engliſh (and in the original too) and for all he picks a quarrel with that (in his 20. *Quæries* &c.) becauſe (perhaps) too narrow

narrow to confine so boundless *a wanderer*; yet it shall be our *Christian Directory*, wee'l keep it preciously, and leave his rotten and superfluous notions to fill up the *vacuums* in the Stationers shops. That *leaven* hath so soured his whole *lump*, that for fear of sucking some *poyson* with his *honey*, we'l be Christians (as well as the Lord shall enable us) without him.

Hold, but he gives you his *extremum vale*, at the door of *eternity*: But is very angry that he is importuned to it from some supream transactions he is hatching in his study. Possibly his next errand may be to send us to *Constantinople* (nor is the scruple extravagant, considering what he has done already) to have a treaty of reconciliation with the *Muphti*, and make some part of *Mahomets* creed (by his vast Authority) Orthodox. But being so successesse in *Christendom*, he may very well despair of that undertaking. But what's his farewel? why he begins with his old quarrel with Mr *Tombes*, railying his defeated quibbles for a new Combat. But he is full of words, and will leade his reader such a dance, that he may sooner grow giddy, then finde the truth, or whereabouts he is; such a continuation of impertinent periphrases (though connext with his wonted Artifice) that *Dædalus's* Labyrinth may sooner be travers'd then the more numerous mazes and perplexities of Mr *Baxter*, and all to ecclips a Gospel truth.

His next project is, to take *Col. Danvers* to task; he thinks it beneath a man of his Talent to let him passe without fixing an Epithete upon

him, as might craftily insinuate him no fit person to inform the world of that abuse in Religion. He thinks that worthy Gentleman encroaches upon the prerogative he himself made bold to seize upon, *viz.* handling cases of Controversy: But he will not part so peaceably with the least *aliquantulum* of it. *A Souldier* (so he calls him) must not enter the lists with this spiritual Warriour; if he does, he'l fling Ink enough in's face; I have heard some say, that his Soldiership, and Mr. *B's* Chaplainship were contemporaries in the same service, and that the later was far more active. Therefore may not that Elogy bestow'd by Warlike *Ajax* upon his opponent, be applicable to our *Ulysses*?

—Quantumque ego Marte feroci,
Inque acie valeo, tantum valet iste loquendo.

But let me tell him in his ear, that if he re-engage any deeper in this quarrel, and persist in his impenitent obstinacy, he'l receive as shamful a foyl as Mr. *Tombes* gave him. For our *Souldier* ha's truth of his side, and ability to manage it, nor does he want an acute and elegant pen, perhaps not inferior to the chaplain, for all his triumphs, and loud applauses of himself, and his attempts to engrosse as vast an opinion of his accomplishments, as the greatest University graduates (though he never, as they that know him say, was a student at any). 'Tis no miracle to find him a match able to encounter him at Quill-skirmishes in this age.

But as to our querulous master of Arts; Mr. *Baxter*

Baxter dealt like a man of warr to ſet him in the Forlorn hope; thinking belike that his confident noiſe would affright us, or his ſcoffs jeer us, or his *reverence* (an epithete he forces upon his modeſty) would cog us over to him, as his dexterous epiſtler inveigled Mr. *Lamb* and Mr. *Allen*. In purſuance to which ſtratagem, the man talks big, brags loudly, and like an *Olympick gameſter* [ſo he calls himſelf, and very fitly, for whoever loſes, he gets by his divinity games, and may in time learn the Eccleſiaſtical politicians *puſh-pin Divinity*] flings on all ſides, traverſes every ground, to get us at advantage, that ſo he may (Comically) inſult, and flout us: for his language ſavours more of frothy ſcoffs, and Romantick drollery, then of ſober, ſerious, or Chriſtian. But γελᾶ δ' ὁ μαρὸς, καν τι μὴ γελοῖον ᾖ.

He thinks he can ſcarce get over any *Anti-Pædobaptiſt* to his party: that indeed is the luckieſt conjecture I met with in him, and I am of that opinion too; for I hope they are a people of more reaſon and ſtedfaſtneſs in the truths they have learnt, then to be ſhaken, by ſo mimick and ayry a companion, that by the pedantry of his ſcoptick ſtyle ſeems fitter for ſtage-pageantry then ſerious conteſts of this kinde.

Beſides the irreligious artifice, and (I may ſay) malicious inſinuations, we meet with every where in his pamphlet, to render the perſon, parts, and principles, not only of his ſober Antagoniſt, but of all that own his way, ridiculous

and hated, so to preingage his Reader to partiality, and anticipate his judgment; is so notoriously disingenuous and dishonest, that I question not, but the Intelligent Reader will easily perceive, that the want of a good cause puts him upon those shifts, to fill up a Book with such *Sarcasm's* instead of truth; as if he had been of the old Womans minde when she took that impious resolution,

Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo.

But is this indeed the man of so clarify'd intellectualls? that puts a Remora in the progresse of truth, to obstruct such as would come over to its Communion? that brags of ransacking the publick library? that has his *album calculum*, &c. (others say, that *Argenteis hastis pugnat*) that has the forehead to charge Mr *Danvers* with plagiarism? when he himself has not a single Argument new, but a furtive collection (mostly, for 'tis but now and then he mentions an Authors name) from those that were formerly engaged in that controversy. So that his whole book (had it been worth the while) may be confronted with continued parallels; being only (in his own phrase) *such trite and outworn things that they have been in effect trampled upon and confuted again and again.* Is he not therefore himself that *Æsops Crow*, that struts so gaudily in other birds feathers?

I cannot but remark how he treads in his Epistlers steps, I mean Mr *B's* idle pamphlet, mis-

mis-call'd *Plain Scripture proofs for Infant-Baptiſm*, &c. who in plain Engliſh, amongſt his other envious calumnies, repreſents the Anabaptiſts, as guilty of Murther and Adultery, for an Imaginary practice he fathers upon them of dipping naked, or in tranſparent garments, *&c.* So *this Anſwerer pag.* 258, &c. But methinks if ingenuous candor and modeſty (altogether unpractic'd by him, though) ſo gracefull in all their poſſeſſors cannot perſwade him to treat us civilly; the awful reverence of an All-wiſe God might keep him from ſuch daring criticiſms upon the plain expreſſions of Scripture, and drawing ſo impious a conſequence from premiſſes pronounced by the unerring creator. For inſtance, it is ſaid *Act.* 2. 41, 42. *They that gladly received the word* (ἐβαπτίσθησαν) *were dipt*, (ſo the word is Engliſht *Luke* 16. 24. *John.* 13. 26. *Rev.* 19. 13. &c.) what then? why then *they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine*, &c. But Mr *Wills* ſays they that are ſo dipt are Murtherers and Adulterers; a more favourable ſence his invective won't bear. 'Tis pitty this wiſe demurrer had not lived in the Apoſtles days, that he may propoſe a more taking model for Chriſtian Ordinances then the holy Ghoſt could inſpire them with: I doubt his carnal and injurious canting would be anſwered as *Symon Magus* in another caſe, *thou haſt neither part nor lot in this matter*. Certainly, if ſprinkling the face were the Lords choice, he could expreſſe himſelf by the word ῥαντίζω, being the proper term for

ſprinkling, (*as* 1. *Pet.* 1. 2. *Heb.* 9. 13. 19. 21. *and* 10. 22. and many places of the *O. T.*) and ſo put the matter for ever out of doubt. Was not Chriſt himſelf ſo [βαπτιδεις that is in Engliſh] dipt in Water? were not the converted Thouſands we read of ſo dipt? And durſt this audacious man fix ſuch ignominies upon a practice that has ſo ſacred a patern? the Lord rebuke him.

But, candid Reader, here thou haſt them counted out of that fort Royal they fancy ſo ſecure, *viz. their modern pretences to a Covenant hereditary title* to Baptiſm: The ſubſtance of what they can ſay in their own defence is examined and ſoberly refuted: The vanity of their ſilly diſtinctions detected, and the Doctrine of the Covenant cleared, and made familiar to the conſcientious peruſer. And ſo the Lord (who will infallibly reckon with Mr *B.* and his confederate, unleſſe they repent, for putting ſuch blocks and remora's in the way to his truth) ſet it home upon thy heart, and give thee a diſcerning ſpirit, to own him according to his directions in his word, notwithſtanding the Ambuſhes and attaques of Satan, and his Engines, in deſpight of whom *truth always ſtood, ſince the Nativity of time, and ſhall ſurvive its utmoſt period and obſequies.*

Let it not defer thee from a ſerious weighing of the Arguments here offered, that ſome of them may be heretofore preſented; that diminiſhes not their force: *Nil dictum eſt quod*

non

non eſt dictum prius. Yet this wrangler Mr *W.* would put us to the trouble of quoting every mans name that has the ſame ſence or like words with us, to avoid his aſperſion of plagiaries: A provident ſhift he has got to eſcape the edge of any Argument that gravells him. May not men often hit upon the ſame thing, from neceſſity of the Argument, or chance, not choice or deſigne? I am certain no man's more guilty in that particular then this Mr of Arts.

But there's need enough of preſſing the ſame things again and again. When they produce new grounds for their practice (but I preſume this from the Covenant is the laſt ſhift) we'l addreſſe New Arguments to confront them; for the current of the Scripture will afford us variety of *Mediums* to quaſh their bold encroachments.

The ſubject of the Covenant (their celebrated Sanctuary) hath not hitherto been ſo ſingly inſiſted upon as 'tis here; although it has been cleared ſufficiently (one would think to candid Readers) *by Mr Blackwood, Tombs, Laurence, Danvers,* &c. whoſe acurate and learned works are enough to ſatisfy every one that would be found in the ſerious and impartiall inveſtigation of truth: And indeed leave ſuch a reader without excuſe.

This Treatiſe is chiefly calculated for the peruſal of ſome ſober friends that importuned the Author to write ſomething upon this ſubject.

subject. And if truth hath any advancement by it, he hath his end. He is careleſſe of popular applauſe or cenſure. He hath contributed his Mite for common information, and undeceiving the many ſouls that ſtill hold faſt thoſe Dreggs and Remains of Popery.

T. D.

The

Ad Clerum *sic Dictum, præcipue* Triumviratum *Novum.*

COnquerar? an Sileam? Nova tollitis arma Ministri?
Christicolis cur non, pax sit habenda prius?

Oro, reformatæ lucis aperite feneſtras:* * cæſura.
Tingere credentes Pagina ſacra docet.

Totus ab aſtutâ Meretrice illuditur orbis?
Fallit imaginibus Beſtia docta dolis?

Illecebris fucata ſuis obſcæna triumphat
Roma? propinquantem neſcit adulta necem.

Fulta Armis Regum caput altum in prælia tollit:
Ægra repercuſſis ictibus illa cadet.

Ægra cadet, certum eſt, Agni certamine: rumpet
Sulphurei ignivomas per Phlegetontis aquas.

Pars convicta Jesu quondam conceſſerat; at nunc*
Impedit egredienſ introeuntis iter! * R.B.

Hæſit in ambiguum, vano Rantiſmate nollet
Spargere; at incerto convehit ore ſonum!

Tempora mutantur, nos an mutamur in illis?
Sumere tot formas, quæritur, unde licet?

B. mordet, duplex Vlatrat, garrulat alter;
His opibus tollit gens inimica Caput!

Fil

Fit ſimplex clangor triplici clamore : nec unquam
Cauſa patrocinio ſuſtinuenda Novo eſt.

Sparſio parvorum Romanâ ab origine, fulcit
Papale Imperium : Caſtra cruenta Necis!

Lux Evangelii per binos emicat axes,
Occiduos inter luciſluoſq; ſinus.

Beſtia *ſæva perit*, meretrix *furibunda peribit,*
Obruta flammiferis nam morietur aquis.

Sic raptim Pacis Eccleſiaſtica
ſtudioſiſſimus.

T. D.

The

The PREFACE.

Courteous Reader,

THou muſt know I do not write this Treatiſe because I think there are not Books enough extant upon this ſubject: But becauſe I obſerve that old books (though never ſo excellent) are laid by, and ſeldom looked into, and nothing's reliſhable with this curious Age but what's contemporary with it ſelf: beſides many of the books already writ ten are ſo large that ordinary perſons cannot attain to the price; and ſome ſo intricate, and deliver'd in ſuch a ſublimity of phraſe, that they are beyond the capacity of divers godly and well meaning Chriſtians. Therefore I have ſent out this without the exteriour varniſh of humane blandiſhments, that I may recommend this truth to every mans conſcience. Eloquence is nothing but Air, faſhioned with an Articulate and diſtinct ſound, and when ſuited to entice and enveigle carnall affections, may do much; but there is a peculiar Majeſty and veneration, upon the brow of truth that will not be beholden to thoſe artificial braveryes: No ornaments render it more illuſtrious then its own native plaineſſe. The end of ſpeech is to make our conceptions intelligible; and when our meaning is carried away by towring expreſſions paſt the reach of a plain Reader, what is it but a gay piece of vanity, and affected pedantry?

I know the difference between the partyes repreſented in this Dialogue, diſtracts the minds and troubles the hearts of many that are Godly. Now in this diſtraction every ſerious man cannot chooſe but heartily

heartily desire and wish for resolution. *And in order to obtain that, the most likely way, is to examine the pretensions and grounds on both hands. In prosecution of which I have selected the most plausible Argument insisted upon by the* Pœdobaptists *of this age (nay the only grand pretence upon which that baffled practise is supported) so that I may say, that all the Auxiliary considerations that contribute to its reinforcement, will fall in the fate, and live and dy with this* Cardinal Thesis (*drawn from the Covenant*) *in its favour.*

Perhaps it may be said, that I make the Pœdobaptists *speak what I please, not what they think, this must be said of course, else they lose their old wont. Nor shall I think it strange, if instead of solid Answers they return their usual Oratory of calumny, and treat me with that severity so liberally dispenc'd to their opposites* [*especially by those writers who enter'd the lists for this cause of late years*] *for their cause requires it. To silence all clamors will be a task of impossibility, and I shall supersede any thoughts of the attempt, but for satisfaction to the tender-hearted and gratious Christian, I say further that I have endeavoured to cull out the strongest enforcements I could finde, and have declined nothing of moment I met within their best Authors; if they think otherwise, let them produce their greatest strength, and lay it down in plain propositions (without that incumbrance and perplexity of words and wheeling phrases, as involve their meanings in puzling ambiguities) and I hope they will finde it fairly examined.*

The Argumentative part which I put into their Mouths,

Mouths, is such as was first taken from thence, and it is but a piece of Justice and restitution to return them thither. They are such as are famously known to be their principles, still the sence, often the very words of their most celebrated Authors.

The reason that I take no more notice of Mr Will's *book is because Mr* D. *who hath already worthyly defended the Historical part, hath promised also to reckon with him as to the scriptural part, and I would not anticipate him, whose works will praise him in the gate, notwithstanding the disingenuous cavils and querulous janglings that fill up Mr* Wills's *invective Pampblet.*

I hope our Opposites will not disallow the liberty they themselves take, of making use of some pious and learned men, that have trod the paths of this controversy before us of late years. I could wish that the voluminous and accurate Treatises of M. Tombs *were epitomized for the information of the ordinary well meaning Christian, the Arguments of the* Pœdobaptists *being there learnedly and solidly confuted, and perhaps to the conviction of many of the learned ones, who (had not reputation interposed, having born a signal testimony to some excellent truths, which they fear might be called in question had they subscribed a Recantation of this) would possibly own as much*

It is not arrived to the degree of Miracle that even good men are loath to own themselves transgressors, and destroy the things they built. Pezelius *reports, that when one from* Frankford *brought* Calvins *institutions to* Luther, *demanding his opinion of it; he replyes* profecto non inepte hic Author dixit,

dixit, *indeed this Author hath not ſaid fooliſhly, meaning that he had ſpoke right, yet recanted not his (oppoſite) Doctrine, but privately communicates his miſtake to* Melancthon, *fearing that a publique conviction might diſcredit all his Doctrine. To conclude, Reader I offer my conceptions of this bandied point to thy candid acceptation, and with this aſſurance that nothing but a zeal for Goſpel reformation ſhould invite me to expoſe my ſentiments to this Cenſorious age, and if they contribute ought to that end, I have my aim, And ſo I commend thee to the good ſpirit of truth, to lead thee into all truth, and remain*

Thine in all Chriſtian Reſpects,

Feb. 10. 1674.

E. H.

A DIALOGUE

Between

A *Baptiſt* and a *Pœdobaptiſt*.

Bap. MY Dear Friend, I am glad to ſee thee, pray what News in the Countrey?

Pœd. O Sir! the Controverſy about *Baptiſm* is again renewed, which I fear will occaſion great differences amongſt Profeſſors; whereas we did hope to live in love and peace together; but I ſee the point muſt farther be enquired into, and the people muſt have more ſatisfaction, before they will walk in communion and fellowſhip together.

Bap. Well; but what is your opinion, do you ſtill hold *Infant-Baptiſm?*

Pœd. Yes, I am ſtill of that opinion, but am willing to be inform'd, for I would not practiſe any thing that is not warranted from the Scriptures.

Bap. You ſay well in that, but have you been at diſputes where you might receive ſatisfaction?

Pæd. Yea, I have been at divers, but their Logical way of diſcourſe does ſo obſcure and hide the truth, that when the Diſpute is done, we are no wiſer then before; now Sir, is there no way to finde out truth but by Logick?

Bap. My Friend, you muſt know, that there is a natural Logick, which all men have, except fools and Idiots, and it is nothing elſe but reaſon methodized: but as for School-Logick which men make a great flouriſh with, eſpecially amongſt women and illiterate perſons, though by it alſo truth may be diſcovered, if men were ingenuous, and deſired truth more then victory: but alas! it is miſerably abuſed by men of corrupt minds, to the deceiving of the hearts of the ſimple; but ſeeing you have mentioned it, I ſhall give you the opinion of a Learned man about it: *Nothing* ſaith he, *hath ſpoyled truth, more then the invention of Logick, it hath found out ſo many diſtinctions, that it inwraps reaſon in a miſt of doubts, tis reaſon drawn into too fine a thred, tying up truth in a twiſt of words; which being hard to unlooſe carry her away as a priſoner; 'tis a net to entangle her, or an art inſtructing you, how to tell a reaſonable lie: like an overcurious workman, it hath ſought to make truth ſo excellent, that it hath marred it.* Vives *ſaith, he doubts not, the devil did invent it, It hath layd on ſo many Colours that the Counterfeit is more various then the pattern. It gives us ſo many likes, that we know not which is the ſame; nature it ſelf makes every man a Logician; they that brought in the art have preſented us with one that hath over-acted her;* But I ſpeak this of Logick at large, there

there may be an excellency found in the art, and it is good to retayn it, that we may make it defend us againſt it ſelf, in matters of Religion, we muſt make faith the means to aſcertain, for other matters ſimple nature is the beſt reaſon, and naked reaſon the beſt Logick.

Pœd. Sir I thank you for your opinion about *Logick*, and I think it were better, if our Miniſters did leſs uſe it and diſpute after the ſame manner as they preach; which is, to lay down a propoſition, and to prove it by Scripture, and reaſon; it would better ſatisfy the people; but we have gone a little out of our way, my great deſire is to diſcourſe with you about *Infants-Baptiſm*: and eſpecially concerning the Covenant, made to *Abraham*, and to his ſeed; which if you can remove, I reſolve to be of your opinion.

Bap. Its true, the Covenant or promiſe made to *Abraham*, and to his ſeed, is the great hinge or Engine upon which the whole buſineſs of *Infants-Baptiſm* moves; now if I prove that the Infants of believing Gentiles are not the ſeed of *Abraham*, then Infant Church-member-ſhip, under the Goſpel, and Baptiſm falls to the ground.

Pœd. True Sir, and therefore pray let me hear your arguments.

Bap. Firſt then, I argue thus. If none be the Children of *Abrahvm*, but thoſe that do the works of *Abraham*: Then infants are not the ſeed of *Abraham*.

But the Antecedent is true, *John* 8. 39. *If ye*

were the Children of Abraham, *ye would do the works of Abraham.* So therefore is the consequent.

Pæd. But our Ministers tells us this is meant of the adult; and not of Infants.

Bap. I know they do so, and they think they had better say something, then nothing, but I proceed.

The Second Argument.

If those that are *Christs, are only* Abrahams *seed*; then Infants are not *Abrahams* seed.

The Antecedent in true *Gal.* 3. 3. 19. *Ergo,* the consequent.

And if you say, Infants are Christs, I answer, some are so by Election, but the Apostle speaks of such as are Christs by calling, not Election: which is secret to us.

But 3dly. If none are blessed with *Abraham* but those that are of faith, then infants are not the seed of *Abraham.*

But the Antecedent is true, *Gal.* 3. 9. *so then they that are of faith, are blessed with faithfull* Abraham.

Ergo the Consequent is true also.

4thly. If the Children of the flesh are not the Children of God, then infants are not now the seed of *Abraham.*

But the Antecedent is true. *Rom.* 9. 8. *they which are the children of flesh, these are not the children of God,* But the children of the promise are counted for the seed: *Ergo* so is the consequent, I say, the children of the flesh may be the children of God by Election, but they are not so by calling, and so not counted for the seed; and if you still urge, as I know you will, that all these places

places are meant of the Adult only, then let us read the words as you would have us, and see what absurdity you will father upon the holy spirit.

First, from *Gal.* 3. 9. *They that are of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham:* and they also that are not of faith.

Secondly from *Gal.* 3. 19. *They that are Christs* (*viz.* visibly) *are* Abrahams *seed*, and they that are not Christs, are *Abrahams* seed.

Thirdly, from *Rom.* 9. 8. *They which are the children of the flesh are not the children of God.* (visibly); and they that are the children of fleth are the children of God visibly.

So from *John* 8. 39. *They that do the works of* Abraham *are the children of God*; *and they that do not the works of* Abraham *are the children of God*; so we must read the words, if these texts of Scripture be not exclusive.

Pæd. It is very true, if those texts be not exclusive, we must read the words, or at least understand them, as you have, said; but then we should make the Scripture guilty of great absurdity, and contradiction.

Pæd. But our ministers tells us, *the promise is to you and your children, and them that are afar off*: by which they understand believing Gentiles and their seed.

Bap But what do you mean by promise? is it the promise and covenant of eternal life and salvation? or the promise of outward ordinances? If you say the first; then we ask you whether that promise be absolute or conditional? If absolute,

then all the children of believers must needs be saved. If you say conditional, and faith and repentance, be the condition, then we are agreed: and the controversy is ended.

Pæd. No, we do not say that by promise in the 2d of the *Acts*, is meant the promise of eternal life and salvation, for that is not made, much less made good to any, upon the tearms of their parents faith; but upon their own personal belief, and obedience, but we mean the promise of outward ordinances, as to be baptized, *&c.*

Bap. Very well; if that be *Peters* meaning, that believers infants shall be admitted to outward ordinances, when others shall not: Then consider what a poor promise this is, and what a miserable comforter he is made by you, in making as if this were all his meaning, and all that he intends by this pretious word of promise. But you must know *Peters* business was to support the *Jewes* smitten down under a sence of sin and the guilt of *Christs* blood, which lay heavy upon them but if this be all he intended you, and your children shall be baptized, *&c.* then the plaister is not broad enough for the soar; for, pray consider and we will suppose *Peter* speaking thus to them: you have by wicked hands crucified the Lord of life, and wished his blood to be upon you and your children, but be of good comfort, believe and be baptized, and then you and your children shall stand under the title of the people of God, under right to outward ordinances, when others shall not, and not only you, but your children shall be baptifed. But neither you nor they

they ever the ſooner ſaved, as born of you, ſurther then together with you they ſhall believe and obey the Goſpel; in which caſe of faith and obedience, all unbelievers in the world and their children, ſhall be ſaved as ſoon as either you or they. It is as much as to ſay, the promiſe of freedome to partake of the ordinances, is to you, and your ſeed above other; but the promiſe of the inheritance is as much to all others and their children, as to you and yours. What moſt comfortleſs comfort is this, to men caſt down under a ſence of ſin and guilt? what a pittiful plaiſter is here applied to men prick'd at the heart, and ſmarting under the direful apprehenſion of Gods wrath? beſides what exquiſite nonſence do you make the *Apoſtle* ſpeak, if his words be taken in your ſence, for they muſt run thus, *viz.* firſt by way of precept, repent and be baptized you and your children. 2ly, by way of encouragement, ſo the priviledge of being baptized ſhall belong to you and your children which unbelievers and their ſeed ſhall not enjoy. But the promiſe of remiſſion of ſins, and ſalvation, is made no more to you then to them; But without doubt it muſt be otherwiſe: the promiſe, take it which way you will, either for the proffer of the promiſe, or the thing promiſed, It muſt needs be of ſome more excellent matter than outward membership, & ordinances, abſtract from remiſſion of ſins and ſalvation: yea, 'tis moſt evident that the thing here promiſed is no leſs then remiſſion of ſins and ſalvation it ſelf, for as no leſs is expreſſed in the very text *remiſſion of ſins, and the holy ſpi-*

rit, which, elsewhere is called the *earnest of inheritance*, So, unless you will divide the children from having a share alike with their parents in that promise, which in the self same sentence, term and sence, is promised alike to them both, so as to say, the word promise, is to be understood of remission of sins, and salvation, as in relation to the parents; but of an inferiour thing, *viz.* a right to ordinances only, as in relation to the Infants only, which were great absurdity to utter, it must necessarily be meant of one kinde of mercy, to both parents and children: yea and upon the same termes too, and no other then those upon which its tendred to the parents, *viz.* personal repentance, and obedience, and so consequently of remission and salvation, and not of such a trivial title to external participation only as you talk of, which if it be, then, unless you assert that God hath promised salvation absolutly to all the natural seed of believers, upon those terms only, as they are their seed, which you dare not stand too, the promise, mean which you will, the bare proposal, or the salvation propounded, or both; upon those terms, belongs of right, not only to believers and their posterity, but also to all men, and their posterity, without difference, when at years of capacity to neglect, or perform them; for the glad tidings of salvation are commanded to be preached to all, and proffered to every creature at years, to hear, and understand; though not to infants on terms of their parents faith; so assuredly the terms being performed, the salvation so promised shall be enjoyed;

enjoyed: there is no right by birth to ſalvation, or the promiſe of it in believers ſeed, more then in unbelievers; nor no priviledge to them more then to others, ſave the meer hopefulneſs of education, and advantage of inſtruction in the way and means of ſalvation; which may poſſibly befall believers children, more then others: though in caſe it happen (as ſome time it doth) that the children of believers, have their breeding amongſt unbelievers, and the children of unbelievers amongſt believers, in that caſe theſe last have not only no leſs priviledge, as to the promiſe of ſalvation by bare birth, but a priviledge alſo by that breeding above the other.

That therefore, that the promiſe of the Goſpel covenant in any ſence in the world, is made to believers ſeed (as barely ſuch) more then to the natural ſeed of unbelievers, can never be proved by the word; yea the contrary is evident from this place *Acts.* 2. 38. 39.

For, firſt neither were theſe parents believers as yet, when *Peter* ſaid, the *promiſe is to you, and your children*; but only were *pricked at the heart* upon ſome meaſure of conviction; that the perſon whom they had crucified, was the Lord of life (which the *devils believe & tremble at*) & in order to begetting that ſaving faith, (which yet they had not) he ſpake theſe words of encouragement.

Secondly, doth *Peter* make the promiſe any otherwiſe to them and their children, then he doth to *all others in the world*, viz. on condition of their coming in at Gods call, 'tis ſayd *to you and your children, and them that are afar off*; all manner

ner of perſons in all nations, and generations, as the Lord our God ſhall call, *viz.* as are prevailed with to come when God calls them; which to be the ſence of this place, is further illuſtrated by that parallel place *Heb.* 9. 15. *they that are called, receive the promiſe of eternal inheritance.*

Thirdly, when the parents did believe, & were baptized; were any of their children baptized with them? which they muſt have been, had that promiſe been to the Infants, as well as to the parents on that ſingle account of being their ſeed, but that no Infants were then baptized, appears, becauſe the Scripture recording how many were baptized at that time, it concludes them under ſuch a term, as excludes the Infant from that days work, while it ſays, *as many*, meaning no more (or elſe we are deceived in the relation) *as gladly received the word* (this Infants could not do) *were then baptized*, which number, as they are recorded to be about 3000 might in all likelyhood have amounted to three times 3000. if all the Infants of thoſe had been baptized alſo; ſo that I conclude, if they had Infants why did they not bring them? or at leaſt ſend for them? here being ſo fit an opportunity, to baptize them; and ſo (for ever) to put the controverſy out of doubt.

But fourthly, neither were there any more enchurched that day, but ſuch as gladly received the word, and were thereupon baptized. For of theſe only (and not infants) its ſaid *they continued together in the Apoſtles doctrine, in Fellowſhip, and in breaking of bread and prayers.* But all their Infants muſt have been Enchurch'd alſo, if they had been baptized.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, it croſſeth the current of all other Scripture to put ſuch a conſtruction upon this, for that the promiſe of old, I mean the old promiſe of the law, which was of the Earthly *Canaan*, and but a Type of this, did pertain unto a fleſhly holy ſeed, I grant. But that the new Covenant or Goſpel promiſe is made to any mans fleſhly ſeed, that thereupon we may baptize them in token of it, I deny. For ſure I am the Scripture holds out no other ſeed of *Abraham* to be heirs with him of the heavenly *Canaan*, but his ſpiritual ſeed, *i. e.* Believers that do his works. Nor doth it own any (but theſe) to have the right of membership and Fellowſhip in his family *i.e.* the viſible Church. For if it ſhould be granted, that the viſible Church is *Abrahams* family, under the Goſpel, as well as under the law: yet it is ſo altered from what it was, ſo different in its conſtitution, that it is even turned upſide down, and in a manner nothing remains as then it was. For as the covenant is not the ſame, with that of the law, ſo neither is there the ſame Mediator, nor the ſame Prieſthood, nor the ſame Law, nor the ſame Law-giver, nor the ſame promiſes: That being of an *Earthly*, this of an *heavenly* inheritance, nor the ſame holy ſeed, to which the promiſes are made: that being to the Typical ſeed, *Iſaac* and his poſterity, this to the true ſeed *Chriſt* and believers Nor the ſame ordinances, theirs being *Circumciſion* and the *Paſſe-over*, ours *Baptiſm* and the *ſupper*. Nor the ſame *ſubjects* for thoſe ordinances, thoſe being (by nature) *Jews* or at leaſt by profeſſion, and their Male ſeed only; ours Male and female

female: theirs, whether believing or not, ours only as believing. So that whatever can be said of the Covenant, the promise, the holy seed; is only this, they were Typical, ceremonial, abiding only to the time of Reformation *Heb.* 9. 9. and are now all abrogated, and out of date, so that we may say (as he) *fuit Ilium*, so *fuit* Canaan, *fuit lex*, *fuit Templum*, *fuit Sacerdotium*, *fuit Sacrosanctum semen*. There was indeed a holy land, a holy law, a holy Priesthood, a holy seed, But all these belonging to a first Covenant which was faulty, are now long since vanished before a better, and *whatever was glorious hath now no glory, by reason of a glory that excelleth.* 2 *Cor.* 3. 9, 10, 12, 13.

Pæd. Sir, I thank you for your opinion of this text *Act.* 2. 39. But though the children of believing Gentiles have no right to the Covenant by vertue of their Parents faith yet may they not have a right by vertue of *Abrahams* faith?

Bap. In no wise; for the natural posterity of believing *Gentiles*, are so far from being heires apparent with *Abraham*, of Gospel promises and priviledges, that even *Abrahams* own natural seed, (as such only) are not at all his seed, at this day, nor at all holy with the birth-holynesse they once had, nor entail'd as heirs of that heavenly *Canaan*, without faith and Repentance in their own persons; and because this is the very root and knot in the state of this controversy, the unfolding of which will discover the whole mystery of your mistakes, all which arise originally from your erring in it, for *error minimus in principio*

principio, ſit major in medio, maximus in fine. Give me leave therefore to enlarge a little upon this point.

Firſt then let it be conſidered, that *Abrahams* own ſeed, even thoſe that were heirs with him of the earthly *Canaan*, though born of his body now (as truly though more remotely) of his body who was the greateſt believer in the world (Chriſt excepted) even theſe are not his ſeed in the Goſpel account, nor heirs of the Goſpel promiſe; nor (as born of his body) to be admitted to *Baptiſm* and Church priviledges, which I make appear from *Rom.* 9. 6. 7. 8. in which pray obſerve how the Apoſtle denies *Abrahams* own Natural Children, the name of *Abrahams* ſeed, in the ſenſe of the Goſpel.

Firſt he magnifies them exceedingly in the 4th. *verſe*, and ſets out their dignity and preheminence above all people under the name of *Iſraelites, to whom pertained the Adoption, and the glory, and the Covenants*, i.e. both Teſtaments, the Type, and the Anti-type, unto whom pertained, not only the giving of the law, but alſo the promiſes, and that not only of the Earthly *Canaan*, but of the Goſpel Covenant in the firſt tender of it, not in reſpect of any right they had to it by birth (whether they received it or not) but as I ſaid in reſpect of the firſt tenders of it, which appears becauſe by ſpeciall order and appointment it was to be offered to them in the firſt place.

Nor was it carried to the *Gentiles* till the *Jews* had ſlighted it, in proof whereof the Scripture is very

very plain *Math.* 10. 5, 6, 7. Christ forbids his Disciples to go to any of the Gentiles, or to any save *the lost sheep of the House of Israel*, yea they were Children at this time, *whose Bread*, (till they loathed it) *was not to be given to dogs except a few crums of it.*

Hence the Jews were first bid to the wedding *Math.* 22. 3. but they would not come. So they are called *the Children of the kingdom Math.* 8. 12. that were to be cast out because they would not receive the Gospel; for *he came unto his own and his own received him not*; yea *Paul* tells the Jews *it was necessary the word of God should first be spoken unto them*, *Act.* 13. 46.

Notwithstanding all which glory and prehemi-nence of this people *Israel* who were the fathers also, and of whom (as concerning the flesh) Christ came. *Paul*, after he had shewed their high priviledges, comes with Alas! and great sorrow of heart, that he was forced to exclude them, (save a few with whom the Gospel took effect) even from the name of *Israelites*, and from standing *Abrahams* Children any longer. For, saith he, (as who should say, the more is the pitty) *they are not all* Israel, *that are of Israel*, that is all that are *Israel* after the flesh, are not Gospel Israelites, *Abrahams* seed are no longer counted his seed, but they that are Christs by faith, are counted for the seed; and that this is the meaning of the words is evident from them that follow. *For*, saith he, *neither because they are the seed of* Abraham, *are they all Children*; *but in* Isaac *shall thy seed be called*, that is, these which

the

are the Childſen of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God, but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed.

A clear illuſtration we have of this *Gal.* 3. 7. 9. where the Apoſtle urges this term, *they which are of faith* (that is, which believe) for none elſe are of faith, *the ſame are the Children of* Abraham, *and are bleſſed with faithfull* Abraham. He ſaith not, they which be of *Abrahams* fleſh, for ſuch are not accounted his Children as to the Goſpel Covenant, much leſſe doth he ſay or mean, that thoſe which are born of the body's of them that be of faith are *Abrahams* children, and ſo to be ſigned, as his ſons by Baptiſm, as his own fleſhly ſeed were ſigned by Circumciſion, as heirs with him of the old *Canaan.* As if becauſe *Abraham* is the ſpiritual father of all that believe and walk in his ſteps, therefore he muſt be a father to all their natural poſterity too, and be the ſpiritual father not of their perſons only, but of their offſpring alſo.

But let me tell you he is not ſo much as a father to his own ſeed, in a Goſpel ſence, neither can theſe ſtand his children, nor the children of God, or heirs of the heavenly bleſſing and kingdom becauſe they come out of his loins, unleſs they do as he did. For though his fleſhly ſeed, as a type for the time then being, ſtood denominated the children of God, and holy in an outward ſenſe, and heirs according to the earthly promiſe, yet that account is now gone, & there is no other way whereby the Jews themſelves, much leſſe any generations amongſt the Gentils can be ſtil'd

the

the children of God, or of *Abraham*, ſo as to expect the Goſpel portion, but by believing in *Chriſt Jeſus*, in their own perſons, *Gal.* 3. 26. *ye are all the Children of God by faith in Ieſus Chriſt; and if ye be Chriſts then are ye* Abrahams *ſeed, and heirs according to the promiſe.*

Another Scripture that proves that *Abrahams* own ſeed, in the old Covenant account are not his ſeed, in the account of the Goſpel, ſo as thereupon to have right to ordinances is, *John* 8. 33. *to the* 40. where Chriſt being cavilled at by the Jews, for promiſing freedom from ſin, to which they were ſlaves and ſervants, notwithſtanding the legal freedom they ſo much boaſted of, diſcovers plainly, the cutting off the Jews from three things.

1. From the repute and denomination of *Abrahams* children.

2. From any ſhare in the ſpiritual bleſſings of the Goſpel.

3. From any further right to Church-membership and ordinances.

Firſt they alledge that they are *Abrahams* ſeed *ver.* 33. *that they were not born of Fornication, ver.* 39. (meaning as *Iſhmael* was) but they *had one father even God* v. 41. To which Chriſt anſwers, not by denying of any of all this, for it was all true in that ſenſe in which they meant it, yea they were *Abrahams* children, and Chriſt confeſſes it *ver.* 37. *I know you are* Abrahams *ſeed*, yea they were all the Children of God, by an outward and Typicall adoption of them unto himſelf. But Chriſt overthrows all, by telling them, that

Abrahams

Abrahams children are accounted of otherwiſe now then formerly ; not as coming out of his loyns, but doing his works, as being allyed to him, not ſo much after the fleſh as after the faith. Whereupon not yet believing he denies them to be now *Abrahams* Children, in the true and ſubſtantiall ſenſe, and that appears in this *Hypotheſis ver.* 39. *If ye were* Abrahams *children ye would do the works of Abraham.* To which do but add the Minor; But ye do not the works of *Abraham* : And then the concluſion ſollows ; Therefore ye are not the children of *Abraham.* You ſee Chriſt aſſerts them to be *Abrahams* children in the old account, ſo as to ſtand members of the old houſe, but denies them to be *Abrahams* children in the ſenſe of the New.

2ly. They ſay they are freemen, and were never in bondage ; this Chriſt alſo grants : it was ſo indeed in the outward Typical ſenſe, they were freemen and heirs of that earthly glory that was promiſed to *Abraham* in that *old Canaan*, but deny's them to be freemen as to the Goſpel, with heavenly freedom of that *Jeruſalem* which is above, which is the mother of all believers *Gal.* 4. 20. yea aſſerts that they were but ſervants, and in bondage to ſin, which is the greateſt ſlavery of all *ver.* 34. *he that commits ſin is the ſervant of ſin.* So that for all their ſonſhips, in truth they were but ſervants. He grants their ſonſhip and title to the old inheritance, but denies it to the new.

3ly. They boaſt or bleſſe themſelves in their ſtanding in the houſe or family of *Abraham*, that is the viſible Church, as to the ordinances, pri-

viledges, and rights whereof, who but themſelves had the title. For this indeed was their advantage of old, that to them were committed the oracles of God To which Chriſt anſwers, true; they did ſtand in the houſe for a time, yet but for a time, and though ſons and heirs in the laws Typical ſenſe, yet they were but ſervants in the Goſpels. And being but ſervants, as *Moſes*, and his houſe, the old Church were; they muſt anon be turn'd out of the houſe, and abide in the Church, that is *Abrahams* family no longer; that believers the true ſons and heirs may come in, as in the 35. *verſe*. *And the ſervant (ſaith Chriſt) abideth not in the houſe for ever; but the ſon abideth for ever. If therefore the ſon make you free*, and that he doth not for all your former freedom, unleſſe you believe in him; *then ſhall you be free indeed*, even to the glory, oracles, and bleſſings of the ſpirituall houſe, the Goſpel Church, which elſe, you muſt be cut off from.

And ſo indeed it came to paſſe within a while, for not believing and repenting, which are the only terms which give right to Goſpel ordinances and priviledges. So that theſe Jews though Natural branches ſtill as much as ever (if being the fleſhly ſeed of a believer could help them,) as to a ſtanding there, were yet clean broke from the root *Abraham*, as he ſtands a root to all the faithful, becauſe only of unbelief *Rom.* 11. 20. when ſuch as were *wild olives*, and no kin at all to *Abraham* after the fleſh, were in their own perſons, but not their natural ſeed with them (ſave as they believed with them) owned as his Children

Children by believing, and as members of the true Church under the Goſpel.

And this was declared by *John the Baptiſt*, and the reſt of the firſt Miniſters of the Goſpel, who would not admit Jews as Jews (though *Abrahams* own ſeed) unto Baptiſm, when they offered themſelves upon the aforenamed terms without faith and repentance. See how the *Phariſees*, *Sadducees*, and whole multitude of *Abrahams* ſeed come to be Baptized. *Math.* 3. 7. *Luke.* 3. 7. pretending and pleading that if Baptiſm were a Church priviledge, it muſt needs belong to them, who were the children of *Abraham*; But ſee how he rejects them, as having no part nor portion in this matter. *O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?* as if he ſhould have ſaid, what have you to do with the remiſſion of ſins and redemption from wrath, which I preach and baptize in token of, being (notwithſtanding your priviledges) corrupt and ſinful in your lives. *Bring forth therefore*, to the end you may be baptized, *fruits anſwerable to amendment of life*; and begin not to ſay, that we have *Abraham* to our father, we are the ſeed of an eminent believer, for *God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up childeen to Abraham.* i. e. God will without being beholden to you, raiſe a ſeed to *Abraham* rather then to want them, from amongſt theſe ſtones; whether he means ſtones literally, or the Gentiles, which were as ſtones in their eyes, it matters not.

But this we gather from it, that even at that very time, when the birth-priviledge and holy-

neſſe of a fleſhly ſeed ſtood in full force, and unrepealed (as then it did) how much more ſince the abrogation thereof by faith, *Abrahams* ſeed could not, much leſs can the ſeed of believing Gentiles, now it is repeal'd, be admitted to Baptiſm without Repentance.

The Jews as impenitent and unbelieving as they were, ſtood uncaſt out of the Jewiſh Church, while the Church it ſelf ſtood: But they could not paſſe out of that Church into the Goſpel Church, nor from their right to circumciſion, prove their right to Baptiſm; yet this they might have done, if what gave right of old to one of thoſe ordinances, doth in like manner in right perſons to the other.

So then ſeeing *Abrahams* own ſeed had no right to Baptiſm, as ſuch, how can you expect it from your ſeed, who are not *Abrahams* ſeed: For *Abraham* hath but two ſeeds, as I know of (except *Chriſt*) the firſt is his ſeed after the fleſh, and ſuch were all thoſe that were born of his body, as *Iſhmael*, and his children by *Keturah*, and thoſe that come of him, by *Iſaac* and *Jacob*; which only were heirs with him of the land of *Canaan* (for *Eſau* ſold his birth-right.)

2. His ſeed after the faith, and they are all thoſe that walk in his ſteps *Rom.* 4. 12. and ſuch that do his works *John.* 8. but to ſuppoſe that *Abraham* hath a third ſeed, and they are the children of believing Gentiles, is a fancy, for, *non datur tertium ſemen Abrahæ.*

Two ſeeds of *Abraham* the Scripture mentions, but a third ſort cannot be aſſign'd, The firſt are only

only theſe that deſcend from his loyns, as the *Midianites*, and others by *Keturah*; the *Iſhmaelites* by *Hagar*; The *Edomites*, and *Iſraelites* by *Sarah*; which laſt only were the holy ſeed, and children of promiſe, in reference to the *Hagarens* in a type, and ſole heirs of the Typical *Canaan*. All theſe I ſay were the firſt ſort, and all believers of what Nation ſoever, are the ſecond ſort; but the natural ſeed of believers are neither of the one, nor of the other.

Pæd. But were not the proſelytes or ſtrangers counted *Abrahams* ſeed, and circumcis'd upon that account?

Bap. No: they were not *Abrahams* ſeed, and circumcis'd on that account; but from a poſitive inſtruction, & an expreſſe command from God, as they were the males in the family of one that was a Jew, at leaſt by devotion, for which ſee *Gen.* 17. 12. 13. *And he that is eight days old ſhall be circumcis'd among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the houſe, or bought with mony from any ſtranger, which is not of thy ſeed. He that is born in thy houſe, and he that is bought with mony, muſt needs be circumcis'd; and in* Exod. 12. 48. 49. it is called *a law, When a ſtranger ſhall ſojourn with thee, and will keep the paſſeover, let all his males be circumcis'd, and then let him eat the the Paſſeover, and he ſhall be as one that is born in the land, and for the ſtranger.* And in *Numb.* 9. 14. it is called an Ordinance. *Ye ſhall have one Ordinance for him that is born in the land, and for the ſtranger.* Shew but ſo much for Infants-Baptiſm, that it is called a law, an ordinance, or hath any

inſtitution for it, and the controverſy is ended. So that you ſee the *proſelites* were circumcis'd by vertue of a law, as they were Males in the family, and not as *Abrahams* ſeed: for ſo they were not, nor heirs either of the temporal, or ſpiritual *Canaan*. In the temporal *Canaan* they had no inheritance, nor any right to the heavenly, unleſs they were true believers as *Abraham* was.

So that the ſum of what hath been ſaid is:

Firſt the ſeed of believers, are not *Abrahams* ſeed.

Secondly, that *Abrahams* ſeed are cut off from all the priviledges of the old Covenant, and are not all counted his ſeed, in the ſence of the new.

Thirdly, that *Abrahams* natural ſeed have no right to the priviledges of the new Covenant, by vertue of *Abrahams* faith.

Fourthly, that ſeeing *Abrahams* own ſeed, his natural children, have no right to the Goſpel-Covenant, or priviledges thereof, much leſſe can the children of believing Gentiles lay any claim thereunto, either by vertue of *Abrahams* faith, or the faith of their own parents.

And ſo I might here end this matter; but becauſe you ſhall have full meaſure, I will add another teſtimony concerning the Covenant, and the little ground there is to baptize Infants, from that Scripture *Gen.* 17.7.

Know then that the Covenant of grace is to be conſidered, either of the promiſe of eternal life and ſalvation, made to all the elect in *Chriſt*, the which remains one and the ſame in all ages, though variouſly adminiſtred, in the times of the old

old and new Testament. Or else of the manner of its Administration, in which sence, its now (in respect of the old Testament administration) which was a distinct Covenant in it self (for the time being) called the new Covenant, and the other to have waxen old, and to vanish away, *Heb.* 8. *last.* Which cannot be said of the promise or Covenant of eternal life, that being an everlasting covenant, and ever remains one and the same. Now its one thing to be in the Covenant of grace, *i. e.* to have a right to the promise, which is only proper to the elect: another thing, to be under the administration of the Covenant, which is common to the elect and reprobates, and depends meerly upon Gods appointment.

Now if the Covenant be understood in the first sence, of the promise of eternal life and salvation, made to the elect in *Christ*: that did never belong to all the children born of believing parents, as might be instanced in *Ishmael* and *Esau*, &c. but only to such as are elected of them, *Rom.* 9. 7. 8. 9. *neither because they are the seed of* Abraham, are they *all children*, &c. The Covenant of grace being first made between *God* and *Christ*, & all the elect in *Christ*. And therefore in Scripture it is cal'd *the promise of eternal life which was made to the elect before the world began*; who are therefore called the heirs of promise, which promise had its first promulgation to *Adam*, in the garden of *Eden*. Where we have also the first discovery of the mystery of the two seeds.

Now the Covenant taken in this sence, is not the ground and reason of administring ordinances

to any person whatever. But the law of institution is the ground or reason of visible Administrations. For the administration of ordinances belongs not to the substance of the Covenant ; but to its administration as to the persons to whom they shall be administred, and that meerly on the law of institution, without any other consideration ; and hence we finde, that from the first promulgation of the Covenant to *Adam*, until Gods renewing of it to *Abraham*, there was no ordinance to be administred to Infants, though some Infants as well as grown persons, both of believers, and unbelievers might be comprehended in the Covenant yet not to be circumcis'd, and so not to be baptiz'd for want of an institution

So the promise in *Act.* 2. 39. *is said to be to them a far off*, in the present tense, while uncalled, *even to as many as shall be called* ; and yet, not to be baptized before calling, unless you will baptize Gentiles in professed Gentilism ; and so the Jews, some not yet born, some not cal'd, have the Covenant of grace made to them, *Rom.* 11. 27. *For this is my Covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins* ; and yet they are not to be baptized till converted.

Nor can the Covenant, considered in its pure nature, be a ministers rule to administer Ordinances by, seeing it is unknown, who are in the Covenant, and who are not ; but that which is their rule, must be something that is manifest.

Secondly, when it is said, that the Covenant of grace belongs to believers children, and that is the ground of their Baptism. If it be meant of

its

its Administration, you have heard, that depends meerly on the law of institution, and hath varied in several ages according to the will of the lawgiver. For during all that period of time, from *Adam* to *Abraham*, there was no Ordinance to be administred to Infants; but when God renewed the promise to *Abraham*, he instituted circumcision, which ordinance belongs peculiarly to the old Testament administration, and was part of *Moses* law, which is now abrogated and done away: And this was the first ordinance that was administred to Infants and not to all Infants, but only to male Infants living in *Abrahams* family if they did live to the eight day, otherwise, they had no right to this ordinance; though many of them doubtlesse in the Covenant of grace and so saved: so we say of Infants in the days of the Gospel, many of them are in the Covenant of grace, and so saved, by vertue of the free promise: But yet not to be baptised, if they do not live to the time of believing and repenting, the only time appointed for Baptism: so that the Administration of ordinances to Infants, depends upon an Institution, and not upon their being in Covenant.

And as to that place *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed*, that is, say you, the Covenat was made with *Abraham*, as a believer, and so with all believers and their seed. To which I answer; The Covenant was not made with believers, and their seed; but with *Abraham* and his seed. Now *Abraham* is to be considered under a double relation.

First,

First, as the father of the Jews, his fleshly seed.

Secondly, as he is the father of his spiritual seed, both Jews, and Gentiles; *Rom.* 4. 11. 12. Now to both seeds, doth God promise to be a God, but in a different manner and respect.

First, he promises to be a God to his fleshly seed, in giving to them the land of *Canaan* for an inheritance, the promise of which is expresly called the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and his seed as on Gods part, *Psal.* 105. 9. 10. 11. 12. which Covenant he made with *Abraham*, saying, *unto thee will I give the land of* Canaan, *the lot of your inheritance*, &c. See also 1 *Chron.* 16. 16. 17. 18. *and Neh.* 9. 8. This, I say, was the Covenant on Gods part. And their obedience to circumcision is expresly called the Covenant on their parts, *Gen.* 17. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you; Every male shall be Circumcis'd. So* Act. 7. 8. *And he gave them the Covenant of Circumcision, and so* Abraham *begat* Isaac, *and circumcis'd him the eight day.* By which they stood engaged to keep all those other additional ordinances which *Moses* gave them, when they were about to enter their promised inheritance as *Gal.* 5. 3. *I testify that whoever is Circumcis'd is bound to keep the whole law.*

Secondly, God promised to be a God to *Abraham*, and his spiritual seed; such as walk in his steps, that is believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, in giving unto them an eternal inheritance *Heb.* 9. 15. incorruptible and undefiled, that fadeth not away, purchased by the blood of *Jesus*, and

and reſeved for them in heaven: of which the earthly inheritance in the land of *Canaan* was but a type.

So, there is a twofold ſeed of *Abraham*, a fleſhly, and a ſpiritual, typed out by *Iſhmael*, and *Iſaac*: and a two-fold inheritance, an earthly and a heavenly. But the heavenly inheritance was not given to the fleſhy ſeed, but only in Types offered to them, and confirmed to the ſpiritual ſeed, who are therefore called the heirs of promiſe. *Heb.* 6. 17. Neither was the Covenant made with *Abraham*, a pure Goſpel Covenant, but a mixt Covenant, conſiſting partly of promiſes of temporal bleſſings, of which *Iſaac*, who is ſaid to be born by promiſe, was the true and proper heir. And partly of promiſes of ſpiritual bleſſings, of an heavenly inheritance; and of theſe *Jeſus Chriſt* was the true heir; and Antitypical *Iſaac*: for as *Iſhmael*, the child of the fleſh had no right with *Iſaac*, in the outward Typical promiſe; ſo *Iſaac* himſelf, by vertue of his fleſhly deſcent, had no right nor Intereſt in the heavenly inheritance, and Goſpel priviledges *Rom.* 9. 7. any otherwiſe then he came to have an intereſt in *Chriſt*.

And therefore we find the Apoſtle in *Gal.* 3. 16. expounding the word of promiſe (*i. e.*) I *will be a God to thee, and thy ſeed*; ſheweth that the Goſpromiſes of *Abrahams* Covenant were not made to any ones fleſhly ſeed, no, not with the meer fleſhly ſeed of believing *Abraham* himſelf: but the promiſes did all run to *Chriſt* the inheriting ſeed to whom they were made; and when Chriſt

was

was come they all center in him: see and consider the text. Now to *Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not to seeds, as of many but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ*; to *Isaac* in the type, but to *Christ* in the Antitype, and in him are all the promises yea and Amen.

Having thus followed the promises down along from *Abraham* to *Christ*, and found them all to center in him; let us now see, to whom they came forth again: And it is not to any ones fleshly seed whatever; but from *Christ* they all flow forth again to believers, and only to believers, and that by vertue of their union with *Christ*; and therefore says the *Apostle*; *If ye be Christs then are ye* Abrahams *seed, and heirs according to the promise*, for there is no other way to partake of the promise but by faith in Christ, *Gal.* 3. 22. *The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by the faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe*; where two things are observable; first, to whom the promise is given, *viz.* to them that believe; secondly, by what means, they come to partake of them,; and that is, by the faith of Christ: so in *verse the* 26. *you are all the children of God, by faith in Jesus Christ*; *and if ye be Christs*, (that is by faith) *then are ye* Abrahams *seed, and heirs according to the promise*: So then it seems all promises run to Christ, and from him flow forth again only to believers. Which being impartially considered, is a full answer to all Arguments drawn from the Covenants, and the promise made to *Abraham*, and certainly and unavoidably

unavoidably cuts off Infants Church memberſhip in the days of the Goſpel, unleſſe the *Pædobaptiſts* can finde a new inſtitution for it. But for a further illuſtration of this, and that you may ſee, that this is not my opinion alone, I ſhall preſent you with ſome ſelect paſſages that the judicious and eminent divine, Dr *Owen* hath upon this ſubject, it is in his *Exercitations upon the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, tom.* 1. p. 55. *&c.* to which the Reader is referred, & which by another hand may be ſhortly improved; In the mean time take theſe few inſtances; *Two Priviledges did God grant unto* Abraham *upon his ſeparation to a ſpecial intereſt in the old promiſe and Covenant.*

Firſt, that according to the fleſh, he ſhould be the father of the Meſſiah; *the promiſed ſeed, who was the very life of the Covenant, the fountain and cauſe of all the bleſſings contained in it. That this Priviledge was* temporary, *having a limited ſeaſon, time and end appointed unto it, the very nature of the thing it ſelf doth demonſtrate. For upon this actual exhibition in the fleſh, it was to ceaſe. In purſuit hereof, were his poſterity ſeparated from the reſt of the world, and preſerved a peculiar people, that through them the promiſed ſeed might be brought forth in the fulneſſe of time, and be of them according unto the fleſh,* Rom. 9. 8.

Secondly, together will this he had alſo another priviledge granted unto him, namely, that his faith whereby he was perſonally intereſted in the Covenant, ſhould be the pattern of the faith of the Church in all generations, and that none ſhould ever come to be a member of it, or a ſharer in its bleſſings,

But

but by the ſame faith that he had, fixed on the ſeed that was in the promiſe, *to be brought forth from him in the world. On the account of this* Priviledge, *he became* the father of all them that do believe; *for they that are of the faith, the ſame are the children of* Abraham Gal. 3. 7. Rom. 4. 11. *as alſo heirs of the world*; Rom. 4. 13. *in that all that ſhould believe throughout the world, being thereby implanted into the Covenant made with him, ſhould become his* ſpiritual children.

Anſwerable unto this twofold end of the ſeparation of Abraham, *there was a double ſeed allotted unto him. A ſeed according to the* fleſh, *ſeparated to the bringing forth of the* Meſſiah, *according to the fleſh*; *and a ſeed according to the promiſe, that is,* ſuch as by faith have an Intereſt in the promiſe, or all the elect of God. *Not that theſe two ſeeds were always ſubjectively divers*; *ſo that the ſeed ſeparated to the bringing forth of the* Meſſiah *in the fleſh, ſhould neither in whole, or in part be alſo the ſeed according to the promiſe*; *or on the contrary, that the ſeed according to the promiſe, ſhould none of it be his ſeed after the fleſh. Our Apoſtle declares the contrary in the inſtances of* Iſaac *and* Jacob, *with the remnant of* Iſrael *that ſhall be ſaved, Chap.* 9. 10. 11. *But ſometimes the ſame ſeed came under diverſe conſiderations, being the ſeed of* Abraham *both according to the fleſh and promiſe, and ſometimes the ſeed it ſelf was divers, thoſe according to the fleſh being not of the promiſe, and ſo on the contrary. Thus* Iſaac *and* Jacob *were the ſeed of* Abraham *according unto the fleſh, ſeparated unto the bringing forth of the* Meſſiah *after the fleſh, becauſe*

they

they were his carnal Poſterity, and they were alſo the ſeed of the promiſe, becauſe by their own perſonal faith they were Intereſſed in the Covenant of *Abraham* their father. *Multitudes afterwards were of the carnal ſeed of* Abraham, *and of the number of People ſeparated to bring forth the* Meſſiah *in the fleſh, and yet were not of the ſeed according to the promiſe, nor intereſted in the ſpiritual bleſſings of the Covenant,* becauſe they did not perſonally believe, *as our Apoſtle declares Chap. 4. of his Epiſtle. And many afterwards, who were not of the carnal ſeed of* Abraham, *nor intereſted in the priviledge of bringing forth the* Meſſiah *in the fleſh, were yet deſigned to be made* his ſpiritual ſeed by Faith, *that in them he might become heir of the world, and all Nations of the Earth be bleſſed in him. Now it is evident, that it is the ſecond Priviledge and ſpiritual ſeed, wherein* the Church to whom the Promiſes are made is founded, and whereof it doth conſiſt, namely in them, who by faith are intereſted in the Covenant of *Abraham*, whether they be of the carnal ſeed or no.

And herein lay the great miſtake of the Jews *of old, wherein they are followed by their Poſterity unto this day. They thought no more was needful to intereſt them in the Covenant of* Abraham, *but that they were his ſeed according to the fleſh, and they conſtantly pleaded the latter Priviledge, as the ground and reaſon of the former. It is true, they were the children of* Abraham *according to the fleſh; but on that account, they can have no other Priviledge then* Abraham *had in the fleſh himſelf. And this was, as we have ſhewed, that he ſhould be ſet apart as*

a ſpecial

a ſpecial Channel, through whoſe loins God would derive the promiſed ſeed into the world. In like manner were they ſeparated to be a peculiar people as his Poſterity, from among whom he ſhould be ſo brought forth.

That this ſeparation and priviledge were to ceaſe, when the end of it was accompliſhed, and the Meſſiah *exhibited, the very nature of the thing declares. For to what purpoſe ſhould it be continued, when that was fully effected whereunto it was deſigned? but they would extend this priviledge, and mix it with the other, contending that becauſe they were the children of* Abraham *according to the fleſh, the whole bleſſing and Covenant of* Abraham *belonged unto them. But as our Saviour proved that in the latter ſenſe they were not the children of* Abraham, *becauſe they did not the works of* Abraham; *ſo as our Apoſtle plainly demonſtrates,* Rom. 4. 9. 10. 11. Chapters. Gal. 3. 4. Chap. *That thoſe of them who had not the faith of* Abraham, *had no intereſt in his bleſſings and Covenant; ſeeing therefore that their other priviledge was come to an end with all the Carnal ordinances that attended it, by the actual coming of the* Meſſiah *whereunto they were ſubſervient, if they did not by faith in the promiſed ſeed attain an Intereſt in this of the ſpiritual bleſſing, it is evident that they could on no account be conſidered as actually ſharers in the Covenant of God.*

We have ſeen then that Abraham *on the account of his faith and not of his ſeparation according to the fleſh, was the father of all that believe, and heir of the world. And in the Covenant made with him, as to that which concerns, not the bringing forth of*

the

the promiſed ſeed according to the fleſh, but as unto faith therein; and in the work of redemption to be performed thereby, lyes the foundation of the Church in all ages. Whereſoever this Covenant is, and with whomſoever it is eſtabliſhed, with them is the Church, unto whom all the promiſes and Priviledges of the Church do belong. Hence it was, that at the coming of the Meſſiah *there was not one Church taken away, and another ſet up in the room thereof, but the Church continued the ſame in thoſe that were the children of* Abraham *according to the faith. The Chriſtian Church, is not another Church, but the very ſame, that was before the coming of* Chriſt, *having the ſame faith with it, and intereſted in the ſame Covenant.*

It is true, the former Carnal Priviledges of Abraham *and his Poſterity expiring on the grounds before mentioned, the Ordinances of worſhip which were ſuited thereunto did neceſſarily ceaſe alſo. And this caſt the* Jews *into great perplexityes, and proved the laſt tryal that God made of them. For whereas both theſe, namely the carnal and ſpiritual Priviledges of* Abrahams *Covenant, had been carried on together in a mixed way for many generations, coming now to be ſeparated, and a tryal to be made* (Mal. 3) *who of the Jews had Intereſt in both, who in one only, thoſe who had only the Carnal priviledge of being children of* Abraham *according to the fleſh, contended for a ſhare on that ſingle account in the other alſo, that is in all the Promiſes annexed unto the Covenant. But the foundation of their plea was taken away, and the Church unto which the promiſes belong remained with them,* that were heirs of

Abrahams faith only.

It remains then, that the Church founded in the Covenant, and unto which all the promiſes did and do belong, abode at the coming of Chriſt, and doth abide ever ſince in and among thoſe who are the children of Abraham *by faith.*

And a little further he ſaith, *No individual perſon hath any intereſt in the promiſes, but by vertue of his membership with the Church, which is and always was one and the ſame, with whomſoever it remains the promiſes are theirs: and that* Not by application or Analogie, but directly and properly. *The Church unto whom all the promiſes belong, are only thoſe who are heirs of* Abrahams *Faith; believing as he did, and thereby intereſted in the Covenant.*

So far this learned man, whoſe words need no comment, nor need we draw any inference, but recite his bare words, which are both perſpicuous and Orthodox; clearly and fully evidencing our poſition, *That believers only are the children of* Abraham, *and none but ſuch have an Intereſt in the Covenant made with him,* which unavoidably excludes infants from Goſpel-Ordinances, untill they believe in their own perſons: And then, and not before, they may lay a juſt claim, *that they are* Abrahams *ſeed, and heirs according to the promiſe.* And if our opponents think Dr. *O.* injured (as they are apt to clamour to that purpoſe) for our improvement of his words to our advantage, he being for Pœdobaptiſm; we ſay, that they are at liberty to reconcile his words to his practice if they can, to do which they have need

of

of a conſiderable ſtock (but they are ſeldome unfurniſht) of artifice, and diſtinction, to help at this dead lift. The Dr. treating about the nature of the Covenant and promiſes made to *Abraham*, (and perhaps forgetting Infant-Baptiſm) opens and expounds them with ſuch ſpirituality and Orthodoxy, as leaves no room for Infant Baptiſm, but excludes it beyond all poſſibility of reconciliation; unleſs it can be proved, that they, *viz. Infants are heirs of* Abrahams *faith, believing as he did; and that the promiſes are theirs, not by application or Analogie, but directly and properly, and by their own perſonal faith,* which I deſpair ever to hear of; though Mr *B.* himſelf, that unparalleld diſtinguiſher, ſhould undertake it.

Pæd. But our Miniſters tells us, that when the promiſes are ſaid to be made to *Chriſt*, it is not meant of *Chriſt* perſonally, but of *Chriſt* myſtically, as in the 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. and ſo its to be underſtood of the viſible Church, of which infants born of believing parents are a part.

Bap. Its true theſe are your ſayings: but, I muſt tell you, we muſt not be put off with fancies, and bare affirmations, but we expect ſolid proof from Scripture. And whereas you ſay, the promiſes are to be conſidered, as made to Chriſt myſtically, that is, to the viſible Church; the contrary appears in *Gal.* 3. 16. where he affirms that *Chriſt* was the ſeed to whom the promiſes were made. And in *vers.* 19th. he ſaith; the law was added becauſe of tranſgreſſion, till the ſeed ſhould come, to whom the promiſe was made: where it is obſervable that the law (*i. e.*) the

Mosaical administration, is said to be before the seed was come, and was to have its period then. Now, if by *Christ* the seed be not understood personally, but mystically, for the visible or invisible Church, (take which you will) then the law could not have been before the seed; for God had his Church in *Abrahams* family 400 years before the law was, of which *Christ* was the head, and they his mystical body. And so by this interpretation, the seed should have been before the law, contrary to the *Apostle* who makes the law to have been before the seed, and to have its period, when the seed to whom the promise was made, was come; and now the promises running to Christ personally, God makes him over for a Covenant to the Elect, and all the promises in him. *Isa.* 42. 6. So that in *Christ* he is our God, and in *Christ*, he takes us to be his people. In *Christ*, and a right to the promises; out of *Christ*, and strangers to the Covenants of promise, *Eph.* 2. 12. So that it is evident, that the promises, respecting the eternal inheritance, and spiritual blessings were first made to *Christ* personally, and in him to his mystical body, the Church, who are united to him by faith.

Secondly, as to that Scripture 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. 'for as the body is one, and hath many members, 'and all the members of that one body being ma-'ny, are one body, so also is *Christ*: It rather seems to be meant of the invisible Church of true believers, then of the visible; for the *Apostle* there, calls none the body of *Christ* but such as ad *received the gifts of the spirit*, and such, as *by*

one ſpirit (as the concurring cauſe) had *been baptized into one body*, yea ſuch *who had received the ſpirit to profit withall*, ſuch, that *had a real ſympathy one with another, verſ. the 26th. If one Member ſuffers all the members ſuffer with it, if one member be honoured, all the members rejoyce with it:* All which cannot (in any tolerable ſence) be applyed to the viſible Church, amongſt whom there are many hypocrites, that never received the ſpirit, nor by the ſpirit could ſympathize one with another, *&c.* But however, it is moſt certain infants are not called the body of Chriſt, if it be meant of the viſible Church indeed, by vertue of the grace of election, ſome of them may be members of his myſtical body, the inviſible Church, but not at all members of the viſible, eſpecially from this chapter; for it is ſaid, if one member ſuffer, all the members ſuffer with it; and the manifeſtation of the ſpirit is given to every one to profit withall, which cannot be applicable to infants.

For none in this Chapter are counted the body of Chriſt, but ſuch as are uſefull to the body, as an eye, an eare, or a foot, a hand, a head, &c. as *vers. 21. the eye cannot ſay unto the hand, I have no need of thee, nor the head to the feet I have no need of you.* So that I draw theſe two concluſions.

Firſt every member in a Chuch ſtands in need of the help of all the other members.

Secondly that every member in a Church muſt be uſefull in his place to the reſt of the members. But of what uſe are infants to the reſt of the members in reſpect to edification?

Now this objection being anſwered, I hope

you ſee plainly, that all the promiſes reſpecting ſpiritual bleſſings, and the eternal inheritance, were firſt made to Chriſt perſonally, and in him they are made over to his miſtical body, the Church, who are united to him by faith, which being well weighed would put an end to the whole Controverſy.

And in the next place you may ſee to what little purpoſe, the promiſe in *Gen.* 17.7. is brought to prove, that God made a Covenant of eternal life with believers and their Children.

The text ſpeaks of a Covenant made with *Abraham* and his ſeed, it doth not ſay with all believers and their ſeed, or all Church-members and their ſeed, neither doth it follow by any neceſſary conſequence, that becauſe God made a Covenant with *Abraham*, and his ſeed, therefore he hath made a Covenant with believers and their ſeed; ſure I am, the Apoſtle was of another mind, who when he expounds the Covenant *Gen.* 17.7. underſtands it to be made to *Abraham*, (as it contains Goſpel bleſſings) not as a natural father but as the father of the faithfull, both Jews and Gentils, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. *he received the ſign of Circumciſion that he might be the father of all them that believe, and walk in the ſteps of the faith of our father* Abraham, *ſo* Gal. 3. 7. *know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the ſame are the children of Abraham*; And theſe only are the ſeed to whom the Covenant was made (in reſpect to Goſpel priviledges) and not to the natural ſeed either of *Abraham*, or of any other believers, as hath been evidently made appear before, and

that

that beyond all Contradiction: And whoever affirms otherwise preaches another Gospel then *Paul* knew, and incurrs that doom mentioned *Gal.* 1.8,9.

Pœd. But we are told that as the Jews and their Children are broken off from the Covenant, so the Gentils and their Children are ingrafted in, in their room, according to *Rom.* 11.20. *because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith.*

Bap. In answer to which, I grant there was a time, when the Jews and their children were broken off, as the Apostle saith, but there are two things to be considered. First, why they were broken off. Secondly, from what they were broken off.

1. Why? Answ. It was not because they had not believing Parents; for *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, were the fathers of them all, and upon whose account they had right to the priviledges of the Covenant.

2. Not because they wanted title, for they were *Abrahams* seed, when they were broken off; but,

3. Because the terms of standing in the Church were now altered; and the Church it self removed: For before the Gospel came they stood members of the old Church, though as much unbelievers for many generations, as they were when they were broken off; and why did not their unbelief break them off before?

But now *Abrahams* Church state is at an end, and all the priviledges and immunities cease;

the Jewish Church must give way to the Gospel Church; the *Messiah* being come, and about to build him a new house, into which none are (of right) to enter, but profest believers; and the Jews not believing now in that saviour who has the substance of the shadows, and which all their types pointed out, and whom all those ordinances signified, yea for whose sake they did enjoy their ordinances, and to which end were committed unto them the oracles of God, the giving of the law, and the promises; yea therefore was their seed counted holy, to point out, and keep them in memory of that holy child *Jesus* that was to come as the Anti-type of all these things: For the old house, or Jewish Church was not intended to abide for ever, but to the time of reformation; then the law must be changed, the priesthood chang'd, the priviledges and ordinances chang'd, the seed chang'd, yea the Covenant chang'd, which they not believing, being willing to abide in the old house still, and to remain Churchmembers upon a meer fleshly and natural birth; still crying out, *Abraham* is our father, and we are his seed, and are free, and were never in bondage: and here it seems they are resolved to stand; wherefore they were broken off, and that whether they would or not, by reason of their unbelief, that is, because they would not believe that the old Covenant and all the priviledges thereof were ended, and the substance come, the Lord *Jesus* the Antitype of their types.

The second thing is, from what they were broken off?

I anſwer, From all the glory they boaſted ſo much of; as the Apoſtle ſayes; thou art called a Jew, and makeſt thy boaſt of God, and truſteſt in the law; but all theſe things are now gone, yea the Typical Adoption, the glory, and the Covenants, the giving of the law, and the ſervice of God and the promiſes; all their birth-priviledges, Church memberſhip and ordinances; which continued but till the time of reformation; yea from that Covenant, which had alſo ordinances of divine ſervice, and a worldly ſanctuary, which is now all aboliſhed, as you ſee *Heb.* 9. 1, 2. 3. 4. *&c.* And all becauſe they did not believe in him, who was the Antitype and ſubſtance of all their ſhadows; but were willing to abide in the old houſe ſtill, and loath to loſe their outward priviledges, their worldly ſanctuary, their ordinances and Church memberſhip upon the account of *Abrahams* faith, for it was indeed an eaſy ſervice, a fleſh pleaſing religion, (if ſalvation could have been obtained by it) notwithſtanding the bondage and laborioufneſs of ſome ſervices, yet how willing would the carnal *Jew* have born all, if he might have been ſaved by the faith of another, rather then to loſe all the righteouſneſs of the law, and to count his circumciſion, and Church memberſhip as dung to winn *Chriſt*, as *Paul* did when converted, *and be found in him only, not having his own righteouſneſſe which is of the law, but that which is by faith in Jeſus Chriſt.*

Thus you ſee why the Jews ars broken off, and from what. But they are not all broken off from the

the Gospel Covenant, for there is yet a remnant according to the election of grace, and as many of them as believe, and repent of their sins shall be admitted to the more easy, and more excellent priviledges of the Gospel Church membership and ordinances, and shall be a pillar in the Temple of God, and shall go no more out.

Besides, we see many of the Jews have been converted, and shall be more generally in the later days.

And if you say, *May not the children of the Jews, be broken off from the Gospel Covenant* ? I answer.

They are no more broken off, then the children of the Gentiles; for those that dye in infancy, as many as belong to the election of grace shall be saved: if they live to years of discretion, and then believe they shall be saved, as soon as any children of believing gentiles.

But if the children of the Jews, be broken off from the Gospel Covenant, it is either because of their parents unbelief, or their own personal unbelief. If it be meerly their parents unbelief, then if any do believe in their own persons they cannot be admitted, because of their parents unbelief, for that which cuts them off, will keep them off; and so the parents unbelief keeps the children from the Gospel Covenant, and so, is the cause of their damnation, for *causa causæ, est causa causati*. But where do we finde that children shall be damn'd for the sins of their parents; the Scripture saith, the soul that sins shall dye.

And if you say, *the Jews unbelief doth not keep their*

their children from the Covenant of grace, but only from the adminiſtrations of it, as Baptiſm, &c. I anſwer, that according to your principles, it amounts to the ſame thing, for you ſay out of the Church no ſalvation.

But if you ſay *their parents unbelief keeps them out of the Church, only during their infancy, when they come to years, if they believe, they may be admitted:* Then it will follow that ſuch children of the Jews, yea of all unbelievers that dye in infancy are in a miſerable condition, their caſe is deplorable, for their parents (*ſecundum te*) can have no hopes of their ſalvation. Poor ſouls! had you lived a while longer, you had been in the Covenant of grace, and enjoy'd the priviledges thereof, but meerly becauſe of your parents unbelief you are cut off while you are infants.

But if this be true, parents have cauſe to mourn to the breaking of their loynes, when their children dye. But *David* was of another mind, who when his child dyed, rejoyced though it dyed on the ſeventh day, the day before circumſion, and that not without hopes of its good eſtate, as learned men conceive; for he ſaid, *I ſhall go to that, but that ſhall not return to me*; which is not meant only of going to the grave, but to a ſtate of happyneſſe, for our going barely to the grave, is no cauſe of comfort.

Pœd. But we are told, that Circumciſion was a great priviledge, as the Apoſtle ſaith *Rom.* 3. 1. *What advantage is there of Circumciſion? much every way*; and therefore, to be broken off, was their miſery.

Bap.

Bap. Its true the *Apoſtle* propounds that queſtion, what profit is there of Circumciſion? his meaning is, that there was a time when they had advantage by circumciſion, and the main was, that *Chriſt* ſhould come of their fleſh; of whom, as concerning the fleſh *Chriſt* came. But this and all other advantages are ceaſed, and now it is a mercy rather then a miſery, (though they thought otherwiſe) to be broken off from the Covenant of Circumciſion; and that it is ſo I ſhall make appear from theſe Arguments.

1. If ſtanding in the Covenant of Circumciſion, did keep up the expectation of Chriſt to come, and ſo deny him to be already come in the fleſh, then their breaking off from that Covenant was a mercy not a miſery.

But the Antecedent is true, *Ergo*, ſo is the conſequence.

2. If while the Jew and his ſeed now ſtand in the Covenant of Circumciſion, Chriſt did profit them nothing: then to be broken off from that Covenant is a mercy, not a miſery.

But the Antecedent is true *Gal.* 5. 2. *If ye be circumcis'd Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing*, (that is if you now continue in the old Covenant) *Ergo*, ſo is the conſequent.

3. If while the Jew and his ſeed ſtand in the Covenant of Circumciſion, they go about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſſe, and do not ſubmit to the righteouſneſſe of God: then to be broken off from the covenant is a mercy not a miſery.

But the antecedent is true, *Rom.* 10. 3. *&c. Ergo*, ſo is the conſequent.

If

4. If the ſtanding in the Covenant of Circumciſion did oblige them to keep the whole Law, then their breaking off is a mercy, not a miſery. But the Antecedent is true; *Gal.* 5. 3. *I teſtify, ſays* Paul, *that every one that is Circumciſed is bound to keep the whole law.*

Ergo, ſo is the conſequent.

5. If while the Jews ſtand in the Covenant of Circumciſion they cannot be juſtified in the ſight of God; then to be broken off is a mercy not a miſery.

But the Antecedent is true, *Gal.* 3. 11. *Ergo*, ſo is the conſequent.

Thus it appears that though the Jews thought it a miſery to be broken off from the old Covenant from Circumciſion and Church membership, from the priviledge of being *Abrahams* ſeed; yet it was indeed their mercy if they did believe and embrace the Goſpel; for now they are delivered from all their yokes, and cruel bondage, yea, from the curſe of the law; *for Chriſt hath redeemed as many of them as believe from the curſe of the law, being made a curſe for them.*

Obj. And if it be objected, then their unbelief was a mercy.

Anſw. It doth not follow that becauſe their breaking off was a mercy, therefore the means by which, was a mercy, for the death of Chriſt was a mercy, but the means of effecting it was not ſo; for they did it by wicked hands.

But had the Jewes believed, they would willingly have broke off themſelves, but becauſe they did not, they were broken off, contrary to their

their own wills, (though for their good). For though it be not a mercy for any perſon to be broke off from any mercy God gives, during the time it is to be enjoyed; But if greater priviledges be offered, and they ſhall adhere to the worſe, (and there being a period put to the former) then 'tis their mercy rather then their miſery to be forced out whether they will or no: as it is a mercy for a man to live in his own houſe, and enjoy the benefits and priviledges thereof; But if that houſe be like to fall upon his head, it is his mercy to be forced out of it, whether he will or not. So *Lot* would willingly have ſtaid in *Sodom*, for the text ſaith he lingred, but God being merciful unto him, forced him out, ſo the Jews would have ſtaid longer in the old Covenant, but God being merciful unto them, took away all their priviledges, and concluded them all under ſin, and made them all as well as Gentiles guilty before God, that he might have mercy upon all.

Pæd. But if Circumciſion and all the Jews priviledges did hold out Chriſt to come in the fleſh, then they ſhould have been broken off as ſoon as Chriſt came, but they were not.

Bap. Its true they were not broken off *de facto*, but *de jure* they were; but *Chriſt* was yet gracious to them, and tendred the Goſpel firſt to them as you have heard, ſaying, he was not ſent but to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of *Iſrael*, and a conſiderable time after the Apoſtles preach'd to the Jews, till they contradicting and blaſpheming, *Paul* ſaid; It was neceſſary the word of God ſhould

ſhould be firſt ſpoken unto them But ſeeing you put it from you, and ſo judge your ſelves unworthy of eternal life, loe, we turn to the Gentiles, whence we may obſerve.

1. How tender the Lord Jeſus and his Apoſtles were to theſe people, and that becauſe they had all the types of Chriſt coming in the fleſh, and the ſhaddows of good things to come, and it was a great pitty that *Iſrael* hath not obtained that which he ſeeketh for, and that they which followed after the law of righteouſneſs have not obtained the law of righteouſneſs.

2ly. We may obſerve that they broke off themſelves, yet not all, the Apoſtle ſaith, 'tis but ſome of the branches are broken off, that is, ſome of *Abrahams* ſeed, for blindneſs is but in part hap'ned to *Iſrael*; And they alſo if they abide not in unbelief ſhall be grafted in again.

So then it is a great miſtake to think that all *Iſrael*, and their ſeed are broken off from the Goſpel Covenant, and the Gentiles and their ſeed come in their room, and ſo their children to enjoy Church priviledges, as membership and Baptiſm. For the Jews, that is the whole lump of *Abrahams* ſeed, are not broken off from the Goſpel Covenant, but ſome only that abide in unbelief, but for others of them that do believe, they have ſtill as great a priviledge, and as much a right to Goſpel ordinances as any believing Gentils in the world. 'Tis true they are all broken off from the old Covenant, that could not give life, that made nothing perfect, which as you have heard is their mercy rather then miſery, if they could believe it.

Pad.

Pæd. But me thinks, believers Children ſhould have ſome priviledge above the children of heathens, or elſe they will loſe ſome priviledge by the coming of Chrrſt, and the Goſpel diſpenſation will be leſs then that of the law.

Bap. To which I anſwer,

1. That it muſt be prov'd that Baptiſm is any priviledge at all to infants, for we muſt underſtand that ordinances are the hard part of the Covenant; and ſo, rather a burthen then a priviledg, without faith; they are part of Chriſts yoke, and though they be made eaſy to believers from their intereſt in Chriſt, and the hope of the recompence of reward, yet they are a burthen to the fleſh, both in reſpect to the performance of them, and the conſequences of them; yea rather a burthen and a yoke then a mercy, and a priviledge, where there is no faith to make them eaſy. But,

2ly. If Circumciſion were a priviledge, (though the Apoſtle calls it a yoke) it muſt be conſidered, whether our infants are capable of ſuch priviledges by Baptiſm, as theirs were by Circumciſion: for,

1. Circumciſion did aſſure them that Chriſt ſhould be born of their loyns.

2. It did inright them to the land of *Canaan* none of which we can expect.

3. By Circumciſion you ſay they were accounted Gods people, and this is the only thing you mean. But,

Is it ſo great a priviledge to have the name without the nature? the ſhadow without the ſubſtance? We uſe to count that a miſery rather then

then a mercy: and *Sardis* is blamed for having a name to live and was dead. Is it any benefit for a man to be counted rich when he is poor: we ſee *Naomies* modeſty is commended, who would not own the ſhadow without the ſubſtance; call me no more *Naomi*, but call me *Marah*.

But in the next place, you ſay infants unbaptiz'd loſe ſome priviledge: I ſay ſome things that were counted priviledges are loſt, for it was a priviledge, that all the ſons of the prieſts were born Prieſts, but it is not ſo now. But further; Its you your ſelves make your children loſe a priviledge ſince the coming of Chriſt, and ſo make the new Covenant narrower then the old: And that becauſe the faith of a believing parent, as you ſay, admits only your immediate children to Church memberſhip and Baptiſm, but as to your childrens children, they have no benefit by your faith, no admittance to Ordinances upon your account; but it was otherwiſe of old; the Covenant of circumciſion, and the priviledges of Church memberſhip, was not only to the next generation flowing from *Abraham*, but to his ſeed after him in their generations, *Gen.* 17. 7. and that not only to the third and fourth generation, but to Chriſts time, they enjoyed the priviledges of the Covenant by vertue of *Abrahams* faith. But now you have narrowed the Goſpel diſpenſation, for you allow Baptiſm to none but your immediate ſeed, by vertue of the parents faith: your childrens children muſt come in upon another account, their parents muſt be actual believers or elſe no admittance.

But what reaſon you have for ſo doing I know not, yea, I chalenge any man to give me a ſubſtantial ground, why the faith of a believer may not now as well inright his childrens children to the 3d & 4th generation to Church-memberſhip and Baptiſm, as the faith of *Abraham* did inright his ſeed in their generations to the priviledges of the old Covenant.

Will you ſay *Abraham* was a famous believer, and therefore had this priviledge above others? Theſe are indeed your ſayings; but muſt we believe it therefore? where is it ſo ſaid? or what neceſſary conſeqence is there from any Scripture, to enforce belief, that *Abrahams* perſonal faith ſhall inright him and his ſeed in their generations? But a believers faith in the days of the Goſpel (though in ſome reſpect more excellent then that of *Abraham*) *viz.* in reference to the *Meſſiah* already come, and Redemption compleated) ſhall inright only his immediate children ſuch as are born of his loynes: ſo that *you make the Goſpel diſpenſation narrower then that of the law.*

And whereas you ſay, *if believers children are not baptized, they have no priviledge above the children of heathens.* I anſwer, That had God ſo appointed, that believers children ſhould have been baptized, and unbelievers children ſhould not, you had ground then to conſider it as a priviledge; but ſeeing there is no inſtitution, you cannot ſay, they are denyed a priviledge: but if it be a priviledge, then (according to your practiſe) you run a great hazard of denying Baptiſm to ſuch to whom it doth belong.

For

For if I should ask you, what sort of believers they are, whose children have a right to Baptism, here you would be at a losse, and must needs say, such only whom you count believers as your practise evidently proves: but it was not so of old, it was certainly known, what children had a right to Circumcision, and what had not: but if you do (as you do) baptize the children only of such parents as you count believers, then you may leave out many thousands of children that have as great a right to it as yours. For there are no persons called by the name of Christians, but do count themselves believers, yea doubtlesse there are many believers amongst them to whose children you deny Baptism, for,

Let it be considered how many sorts there are, who count themselves believers.

1. The *Papists* have their believers, and they are such, as own Christ to be the son of God, and believe all the Articles of the Church of *Rome*, *&c.* amongst whom surely God hath some people, for it is said, *come out of her my people.*

2. The *Episcopalians* have their believers, that is, such whom they count so, and they are such that believe that Christ is the son of God, that he dyed for sinners, and that whoever believes in him shall be saved, and so the whole nation owning and professing the faith of Christ, they baptize all their children, amongst whom there are many thousand real believers, and so their children have as much right to Baptism as yours.

3. The *Presbyterians* have their believers, and they are such (that is, so accounted) who own

the faith of Chriſt, profeſſe regeneration, and are morally righteous in their lives and converſations.

4. The *Independants* have their believers, and they are ſuch who own the faith of Chriſt, make a perſonal manifeſtation of their faith and repentance, and ſo are enchurcht and become members (by a Covenant) of ſome particular congregations.

Now pray tell me which of all theſe ſorts of believers have right to have their children baptized? If you ſay all of them, then you contradict your own practiſe, it being famouſly known, that ſome of you will baptize none but them of your own party. But if you ſay thoſe children only have right to Baptiſm, whoſe parents we count believers, then you run a hazard of denying Baptiſm to the children of diverſe whoſe parents are as true believers as your ſelves, and ſo deny them the priviledges of the Covenant, and in as much as in you lyes occaſion their damnation, as you uſe to tell the Baptiſt.

And if you ſay, ſo the Baptiſts themſelves may keep perſons from Baptiſm, to whom of right it doth belong, and ſo are equally guilty.

I anſwer, that cannot be, for our principles are, that no perſon hath right to Baptiſm, but he that deſires it upon the profeſſion of his faith and repentance: to ſuch a perſon we do not deny it, uuleſſe his profeſſion be contradicted by an unholy life. By all which it appears,

1. That you (practically) deny the priviledge of Baptiſm to many that have as real a right to it, as your ſelves.

2. That

2. That you count the children of diverſe true believers to be in no better condition then heathens.

3. You do extreamly narrow the Goſpel diſpenſation, (a fault you uſe, though unjuſtly, to charge the Baptiſts with) and ſo make the priviledges of the Goſpel, leſſe then the priviledges of the law; for whereas of old all the ſeed of *Abraham*, all his numerous poſterity were circumcis'd, and that whether their parents believed, or not, there was no queſtioning of their faith, no enquiry into their converſations, *&c.* But now you, (practically) own no children to have right to Baptiſm, but thoſe whoſe immediate parents have given ſome viſible demonſtration of their converſion, and manifeſted their faith and Repentance, who are ſo few, that were their number reckoned up, it would not amount to one amongſt a hundred of them that are true believers, in the world.

But further, if the children of believers only (as you ſay) have right to the Covenant and Baptiſm, and that of ſuch believers as you count ſo; and ſo, their parents, only, have hope of their ſalvation; then what ſhall become of the children of unbelievers, yea of ſuch, whom you count unbelievers? may not they make this appeal to their parents, and ſay? O wretched and miſerable parents, that have brought forth ſo deplorable an off ſpring; other children as ſoon as they are born are in the Covenant of grace, and by vertue of their parents faith, have a right to Church memberſhip and baptiſm, wherein they

are made children of God, heirs of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. But wo and alas to us, that ever we were born of unbelieving parents, or at least of such that were never enchurcht, nor members of any *Presbyterian* or *Independant* congregation. We are unholy, unclean, doggs that must not meddle with the childrens bread, without the pale of the Church, aliens from the common weal of *Israel*, without hope and without God in the world. We must not be admitted to the priviledges of the Covenant of grace, though diverse of our parents are professed Christians, and believe Christ crucified, *&c.* yet because they have not made a personal manifestation of their faith and repentance, and so joyned to some Church diverse ministers will not admit us to Baptism.

But stay children, there is hope for you for all this: If you dye in infancy, as many of you, as belong to the election of grace shall be saved, though ye are not baptized, and if you live to years of discretion, and understanding, if then you believe in Christ and repent of your sins, and obey the Gospel, you shall be saved as soon as they, yea upon those terms, and none other, shall those that are Baptized in their infancy be saved if they live to years of understanding.

Pæd. Well Sir I see, it is a hard matter to prove that the infants of believers have a right to the Covenant, more then the infants of unbelievers, but yet methinks they should have right to the administration of the Covenant.

Bap. In no wise; and that for the want of an institution,

inſtitution, as you have heard, and it is anſwer enough to ſatisfy any that are willing to be ſatisfy'd: for none ever had a right to the adminiſtrations of the Covenant any otherwiſe then by vertue of a law; had it been otherwiſe of old, then *Enoch*, *Lot*, *Noah*, and their ſeed had been circumcis'd; and *Iſhmael*, *Eſau*, and others had not been circumcis'd: now if the natural branches, the ſeed of *Abraham* had not this priviledge to be circumcis'd by vertue of a right, but vertue of a law, how can you expect that your infants ſhould have a right to the adminiſtrations of the Covenant by vertue of your faith? Beſides you your ſelves deny one adminiſtration to your infants, but what reaſon you have for ſo doing I know not, ſeeing the ſame grace is ſignified in both. Will you ſay, becauſe your children are not capable to examine themſelves? then let them plead their own cauſe, and ſuppoſe they ſhould make this *Apoſtrophe* to their parents?

O, our tender and indulgent parents, you have brought us into the viſible Church as you ſay, and admitted us to Baptiſm and memberſhip; but why muſt we not partake of the Lords ſupper, that ſoul ſtrenghtning and ſoul-nouriſhing ordinance? you take care to feed our bodies dayly, and that in order to our growth, and have you no pitty to our ſouls? muſt they ſtarve? the children of the Jews of old were admitted to the paſſeover, all the males were to appear thrice in a year, and very early partook of that Sacrament, and were inſtructed in the uſe and end of it, and have we loſt this priviledge by this coming of

Christ? besides the ancient Church did use it, for many years, and must we be kept from it till we be come of age? yea, and not then neither (notwithstanding our Baptism contrary to all Scripture president) unless we make a personal manifestation of our faith and repentance. Will you say, it is because we cannot examine our selves? We answer that Scripture concerns the Adult, not us. You might as well have kept us from Baptism, because we could not believe and repent; but surely the Apostle never intended that infants should examine themselves.

Besides you say we are clean, holy with a federal holyness, innocent, in the Covenant of grace, Church members, that we have habituall faith, and without any sin (except original) therefore there is no need of self-examination. Why then are we not admitted? will our parents faith serve to admit us to Baptism, and not to the supper? Who will unriddle this? surely we want some *Alexander* to cut this Gordian knot; for none will ever untie it.

But again; if infants have a right to the administration of the Covenant by vertue of the parents faith, then if the parents turn Atheists, or Apostates, the children lose their right, and are cast out from the said priviledges. That it must be so appears, if we consider, *Rom.* 11. 20. *thou standest by faith*; (that is, say you) thou standest in the Gospel Covenant, and hast right to ordinances by vertue of their own faith; and thy children by vertue of thine. Now this standing is not unalterable, a state which cannot be fallen from; but

but a changable ſtate from which thou mayſt fall, for the Apoſtle adds, *be not high minded, but fear.* Now if thou falleſt by unbeliet, and ſo caſts out thy ſelf, thy children muſt needs be caſt out with thee; for *ablatâ cauſâ tollitur effectus*, take away the cauſe, and the effect ceaſeth: thy perſonal and actual faith was the ground and cauſe of thy Childrens admittance, ſo then thy unbelief muſt diſpriviledge them, for ſo it was with the Jews when they were cut off, how many thouſands of their infants were cut off with them from membership & ordinances, & remain ſo to this day by reaſon of their parents unbelief; And do you expect a greater priviledge then the natural branches: the Apoſtle lays them in an equal ballance *Rom.* 11. 20, 21, 22. and what ground have you to expect better; the unbelief of their parents broke off their Children: By unbelief they were broken off, and thy ſtanding is but conditional, if thou abide in his goodneſs, otherwiſe thou ſhalt be cut off. By which you ſee what abſurdities and contradictions to your own practiſe, your opinion leads to; if the father be caſt out, the children muſt be caſt out with him.

Thus you ſee that as the children of believers have no right to the Covenant of grace, more then the Children of unbelievers, by vertue of their parents faith; ſo, they have no right to the adminiſtration of the Covenant, for want of an inſtitution, there being no precept nor preſident in the word of God for ſuch a practiſe.

Pœd. But though there be no precept nor preſident for Infants-Baptiſm, yet our Miniſters

ſters tells us, there is no weight in that Argument, for though we do not finde it written, that Infants were baptized, (yet perhaps ſome were,) for a negative Argument don't conclude.

Bap. Indeed *Mr Wills* ſays ſo, and *Mr Sydenham* before him, and diverſe of your Miniſters, and here they cry, *Victoria*; this being their beloved Argument they ſo much boaſt of; but,

Quiſquis amat ranam, ranam putat eſſe Dianam; but pray ſtay a while, and let us conſider what veriety is in this poſition, *a negative Argument don't conclude.*

It's true in ſome caſes, it doth not, but in the matter of poſitive worſhip, we have the opinion of diverſe able and Godly men, who have told us, that *what is not commanded in the worſhip of God, is forbidden*, and that *every affirmative command of Chriſt includes a negative.* But if it be true that a negative Argument concludes not in matters of Worſhip; then this had been a good plea for *Nadab*, and *Abihu*; *Levit.* 10. who were deſtroyed for offering ſtrange fire which God had not commanded, they might have ſaid; Lord, its true thou haſt not commanded this ſtrange fire, ſo thou, haſt not forbid it, and *a negative Argument don't conclude.*

So God commanded *Abraham* to circumciſe the eighth day, but he did not forbid the 7th day, *And a negative Argument don't conclude.*

So in the paſſeover God commanded a Lamb, a male of the 1ſt year to be eaten; but he did not forbid an ewe, or a Ram of the 2d or 3d year, and

a

a negative Argument don't conclude.

So, God ſmote *Uzzah* for holding the Ark, but he might have ſaid; Lord thou haſt not forbid me to ſupport the Ark, when the Oxen did ſhake it and *a negative Argument don't conclude.*

So, when God threatens Idolatrous *Iſrael*, for cauſing their ſons and daughters to paſſe through the fire to *Molech, which the Lord commanded not, neither came it into his heart Jer.* 32. 35. Yet they might ſay, though he had not commanded it, ſo he had not forbidden it, and *a negative Argument don't conclude.*

So, God hath not forbid Cruciſixes, beads, Altars, praying to Saints, Images in Churches, pilgrimages, the Croſſe in Baptiſm *&c.* and *a Negative Argument don't conclude.*

So God hath not forbid unbelievers children to be Baptized, nor the children of believers to communicate in the Lords ſupper; and *a negative Argument don't conclude.*

Laſtly, Bells are not forbidden to be Baptized, and *a negative Argument don't conclude.*

Pæd. Bnt Mr. *Wills* ſaith that Bells are not *ſubjectum capax*, a ſubject capable.

Bap. I anſwer wherein lyes their incapacity? Cannot a Miniſter ſprinkle a little water upon a Bell, and uſe the words of Inſtitution in as ſolemn a manner, as he does, when he Baptizes a child? Or are they uncapable for want of an Inſtitution? We ſay the ſame of infants.

But if he ſay they are not capable of the uſes and ends of Baptiſm as men are, I anſwer.

If God had pleaſed he could have made them (by

(by an inſtitution) capable of ſome ſacred uſefulneſs, yea, capable of relative holineſs, as well as *Aarons* bels, or the bels mention'd *Zec.* 14.20. upon whom it was written, *holyneſs to the Lord.*

But its well known there are thoſe in the world, who think themſelves as wiſe as Mr. *Wills* that judge Bells capable ſubjects of Baptiſm, and have done ſo diverſe ages.

Thus you ſee what abſurdities follow from that poſition; But ſurely God is more jealous of his honour, and tender of his worſhip, then to leave it to the pleaſure of ſuperſtitious perſons; And that God in all ages hath teſtified his diſlike, yea abhorrency of will-worſhip, and that becauſe he hath not commanded it. See *Jer.* 7. 31. *They have built the high places unto Tophet, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart*: See, what God never commanded, never came into his heart; and for this he threatens great judgments, in the following verſes. So *Ezek.* 43. 8. *they have ſet their threſholds by my threſhold, and their poſts by my poſts, wherefore I have conſumed them by mine anger.* But pray let us reaſon a little about it, and be ſerious in this matter. Do you think will worſhip is no ſin? when the ſame perſon who is to perform the obedience, ſhall dare to appoint the laws? Implying a peremptory purpoſe of no further obſervance then may conſiſt with the allowance of his own Judgment, whereas true obedience muſt be grounded on the Majeſty of that power, that commands, not on the judgment of the ſubject or benefit of the precept propoſed. Divine laws require obedience,

not

not ſo much from the quality of the things commanded, as from the Authority of him that inſtitutes them: We are all ſervants of God, and ſervants are but living inſtruments, whoſe property is to be governed by the will of thoſe, in whoſe poſſeſſion they are. Will-worſhip and ſuperſtition, well may they flatter God, they cannot pleaſe him. He that requires us to deny our ſelves in his ſervice, doth therein teach us, that his commands ſtand rather in fear then in need of us; in fear of our boldneſs, leſt we abuſe them, not in need of our judgment to poliſh or alter them.

The conqueſt of an enemy againſt the Command of his General, coſt a Roman gentleman his life, though his own father were the Judge. *Chriſ.* in *Rom. Hom.* 2.

And the killing of a *Lyon* contrary to the laws of the Kings hunting (though it were only to reſcue the King himſelf) coſt a poor Perſian his head. *Briſſon. de Reg. Pers. lib.* 1.

So the overwiſe induſtry of the Architect in bringing not the ſame but a fitter piece of timber, then he was commanded to the *Romiſh Conſul*, was rewarded with nothing but a bundle of rodds. So jealous and diſpleas'd are even men themſelves to have their own laws undervalued by the private judgments of thoſe, who rather interpret then obey them.

And therefore we find that thoſe men who erected the Fabricks of ſuperſtition and will-worſhip, yet endeavoured to derive the original of them from ſome divine Revelations, And the Roman Captain *Scipio*, before the undertaking any

buſineſs,

buſineſs, would firſt enter the *Capitoll*, and pretend a conſultation with the Gods. And generally in all the Roman ſacrifices, the Miniſter or ſervant was to attend a command before he was to ſtrike the beaſt that was offered.

Semper agatne? rogat, nec niſi juſſus agit. Ovid.

Horrible then, and more then heatheniſh, is the impiety of thoſe, who mixing humane inventions and appointments of their own with the inſtitutions of God, and impoſing them as divine duties, with a neceſſity of obedience, do by that means take Chriſts divine prerogative out of his own hands, and ſo make themſelves joynt Authors of his Sacraments; yea rather indeed the deſtroyers of them; For he that practiſes an Ordinance otherwiſe then Chriſt hath inſtituted, doth not honour the Ordinance but an Idol of his own making.

This the Apoſtles durſt not do; they tell us they declared unto them the Counſell of God; but nothing elſe. And *Paul* tells the *Corinthians, he delivered nothing unto them, but what he had received from the Lord,* 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. and ſure he did not receive Infants-Baptiſm from the Lord; for he never declares it unto them.

This therefore ſhould be a boundary to Miniſters, that they deliver nothing to the people, but what they have received from the Lord. That faith that was once delivered to the Saints muſt be preach'd and contended for, but nothing elſe: and if Miniſters have not received Infants-Baptiſm from the Lord, and if they cannot prove that it was once delivered unto the Saints, it is not to be

be preached. It is ſad to think how full our pulpits are of vain traditions and humane mixtures; as if the all-wiſe God wanted the help of dim-ey'd man to mend his worſhip by mixing their Inventions with Gods inſtitutions. But as to mixtures they are uſeful only for theſe two purpoſes; either to ſlacken and abate ſomething that is exceſſive; or to ſupply ſomething that is deficient: And ſo all heterogeneous mixtures do plainly intimate, either a vitiouſneſſe to be corrected, or a defect to be ſupplyed: Now it were great wickedneſſe to charge any of theſe upon the pure and perfect word of God, and by conſequence to uſe deceit by adulterating of it; either by ſuch gloſſes as diminiſh and take away the force of it, or by the addition of humaue Traditions as argue any defect. So that to ſtamp any thing (of but an humane original) with a divine character, and obtrude it upon the conſciences of men; to take any dead child of ours, as the harlot did, and lay in the boſome of the Scripture, and father it upon God; to build any Structure of ours in the road to Heaven, and ſo ſtop up the way; is one of the higheſt, and moſt daring preſumptions that the pride of man can aſpire unto: To erect a throne in the conſciences of his fellow creatures, and to counterfeit the great ſeal of heaven for the countenancing his own forgeries, is a ſin moſt ſeverely provided againſt by God, with ſpecial prohibitions and threatnings: ſee *Deut.* 12. 32. *What thing ſoever I command you, obſerve to do it, thou ſhalt not add thereunto, nor diminiſh from it.* So *Deut.* 18. 20. *The prophet that*

that ſhall ſpeak a word in my name, that I have not commanded, even that prophet ſhall dye. So *Jer.* 26. 2. and *Prov.* 30. 6. *Adde not unto his words, leſt he reprove thee, and thou beeſt found a lyer.*

And that will-worſhip is ſo great a ſin, we have the teſtimony of that learned man M. *Greenhill* in his *expoſition* upon *Ezekiel*, where he hath theſe Obſervations, fit to be written with the the point of a Diamond, upon the heart of every Chriſtian.

1. *That men love to have ſomthing of their own in worſhip, they are not content with what the infinite wiſe God commands them, but will be adding. The ſecond Commandement ſhews that man is prone to be medling, and making ſomthing in Worſhip till he marrs.* Iſrael *provoked God to anger with their Inventions:* Pſal. 106. 29.

2. *God is not pleaſed with any thing in worſhip which is not his own. It is not the works of mens hands, nor their heads that are pleaſing to him; that which pleaſes God muſt come from God, what he appoints he approves, and nothing elſe.*

3. *That will-worſhip and mixtures of mans inventions with Gods pnre ordinances, are the great Canons that batter Cities, and the Gunpowder that blows them up.*

Theſe bring the Lord of hoſts to warr againſt them; it was the Calves that wounded Iſrael, *and laid their Cities waſt.* Hoſ. 10. 5. *the Inhabitants of* Samaria *ſhall fear, becauſe of the Calves of* Bethaven.

4. *That falſe worſhip doth grive God* Ezek. 6. 9. I am broken with their whoriſh heart, their ſuperſtitions

perſtitious *and corrupt mixtures, did not ſimply diſpleaſe God, but oppreſſed, afflicted, and broke his heart. Great injuries enter deep, and eat up the ſpirits of any they are done unto ; and what greater wrong can be done to God then to ſet at nought his Counſels, forſake his worſhip, and impoſe that which he never commanded ; yea it draws away the heart of men from God : and therefore they are ſaid to go a whoring from God by their own inventions.*

5. *Will-worſhip is a work of darkneſs* Ezek. 8. 12. *See what the Ancients of the houſe of* Iſrael *are doing in the dark.*

6. *Will-worſhip is that which God will not honour with his preſence. Neither Chriſt nor the Angels will be preſent at it, as* Ezek. 9. 2. *The ſix men in the viſion that came into the Temple ſtood beſides the brazen Altar ; they had made a golden Altar, thinking that would pleaſe God better, but they would not come at it, but ſtood by the brazen Altar which was of Gods appointment.* Hæc ille.

Thus you ſee that will-worſhip is a horrible ſin; and methinks you ſhould examine whether Infant Baptiſm be not will-worſhip, as having no inſtitution : and if it be will-worſhip, it is not only evil in it ſelf, but ſtands aggravated with this circumſtance, that it makes void the commandement of God ; for will-worſhip doth uſually oppoſe ſome part of Gods true worſhip (as Infants-Baptiſm doth believers Baptiſm in theſe nations) as *Chriſt* told the *Phariſees* ; *you make void the Commandments of God by your Traditions.*

Pæd. But theſe perſons you mention in *Ezekiel*, againſt whom God threatens ſuch Judg-

ments were Idolaters: And I hope you do not count Infant-Baptiſm Idolatry.

Bap. That Infant-Baptiſm is will-worſhip and Superſtition is evident. But whether it be Idolatry? I leave that to enquiry.

But I ſhall give you the Definition of Idolatry, as we have it from our Proteſtant Divines; which, ſay they, *is to worſhip a falſe God, or the true God in a falſe manner.* And that appears from the Second Commandment, where all kinde of Idolatry is forbidden, as all ſin is forbidden in the ten Commandements, though not in expreſſe words, yet in the meaning thereof; For it is a received Maxime, *That all ſins forbidden by the word, are reducible to the* 10 *Commandements, and fall under the prohibition of one of them, or other*: For upon the two tables of the law, hang all the law and the prophets, *Math.* 22.40. Now it is plain, all ſins are not contained in the letter of the Commandements; and therefore we muſt open the later by *Synechdoche's*, and *Metonymies*; *Synechdoches* do comprehend all ſins of the like kinde, and all the degrees thereof: and *Metonymies* do comprehend all cauſes, and means, and occaſions thereof; ſo that for opening the 2d. Commandement, which forbids both making and the worſhiping any image or ſimilitude, it is requiſite to conſider in what ſence or reſpect Images or ſimilitudes are forbidden.

Images or ſimilitudes then, are forbidden, not as Objects of worſhip, for all falſe objects of worſhip, are the falſe Gods forbidden in the firſt Commandement: but Images and ſimilitudes are

are forbidden in the 2d Commandement, not as falſe objects or worſhip, wherein the worſhip of God is terminated; but as falſe means of worſhiping the true God. The *Golden Calf* was not conſidered as the God of *Iſrael*, but as an Image of that *Jehovah*, which brought them out of *Egipt*; whence it is ſaid that *Aaron* proclaimed a feaſt, not to the Calfe, but to *Jehovah*, whereof the Calfe was an Image: the Calfe then was not the God, but an Image of that God they worſhipped, as that which reſembled him, and put them in minde of him.

And then further, the Image forbidden in the 2d Commandement, is, not only a falſe means of worſhip deviſed by man; but a falſe manner alſo: and therefore when the *Samaritan*-ſtrangers knew not the manner of worſhiping God in the Calves of *Jeroboam*, it is ſaid *they knew not the manner of the God of the Country* 2 *King.* 17. 26. and one of the Prieſts was ſent to teach them the manner of fear (or worſhip) of *Jehovah*; and ſo they feared *Jehovah* after the ſame manner that was in ſerving him after their own deviſing.

So that under this one kinde of falſe worſhip is forbidden by a *Synechdoche* not only all worſhip of God in carved, moulten, or painted Images (all bodily repreſentations) of God; but all ſpiritual Images too, which are the Imaginations and inventions of man, whether they be ordained for worſhip, as the high places, and the deviſed feaſt of the eighth Month 2. *Kin.* 12. 33. or whether they be brought in, and uſed as helps and means of worſhip, as the ſtrange fire of *Nadab*

Lev. 10, and *Davids* new Cart to carry the *Ark*; he did not make a new *Ark*, but a new cart; which deviſe of his, there being no command for it, fell under the condemnation of the ſecond Commandement. And ſo all Images and Imaginations of men, all forms and manner of worſhip, deviſed by man, and not ordained by God are forbidden as Idolatrous.

Pæd. But Sir if your way be true, is it not ſtrange, that ſo many learned men ſhould be of a contrary opinion?

Bap. No, it is not more ſtrange then that there are ſo many learned men againſt the Proteſtant Religion; and eſpecially againſt your practiſe of baptizing the children of believers only, and upon thoſe grounds you do it; for the whole Chriſtian world (as its called) of learned men are againſt your grounds of baptizing Infants, for they adminiſter Baptiſm for the *taking away of Original ſin*, and to *confer grace*, and that not reſtrained to ſuch believers Infants, as you do it, but to the Infants of *all perſons* in the nations where they live: ſo that your opinion is a very novelty.

2. But Secondly, it is not ſtrange if you conſider what Chriſt ſaith, *Math.* 11. 25. *I thank thee O father, that thou haſt hid theſe things from the wiſe and prudent*, &c. *Even ſo becauſe it ſeemed good in thy ſight.* There is the reaſon given, it is, *beneplacitum*, his good pleaſure.

3. And Thirdly, I anſwer; we have not been without the teſtimony of learned men, not only in this, but in former ages; for it is well known

that

that Infant-Baptiſm was very early oppoſed, and for any thing I know as ſoon as it was born, for no Antiquity mentions Infant-Baptiſm to have any peaceable being in the world any long time before it was oppoſed; and if it be ſaid it was not oppoſed at the beginning as ſoon as we heard of it in the world. It may be ſo, for Chriſt ſaith, *while the ſervants ſlept the evil ones ſow'd tares*; and ſurely it was a ſleepy time amongſt Chriſtians when it came in, but when they begun to awake, they oppoſed it.

Beſides all this, we have the teſtimony of ſome of your own party, whoſe tongues and pens God hath (at leaſt) ſo over-ruled, that they have born a famous teſtimony for our practiſe.

Firſt *Doctor Taylor* ſaith, *This indeed is true Baptiſm, when it is both in the Symbol, and in the miſtery; whatſoever is leſſe then this, is but the Symbol only and a meer ceremony, an* opus operatum, *a dead letter, an empty ſhadow, an inſtrument without an agent to manage it.*

2ly, *Baptiſm is never propounded, mentioned, or enjoyn'd as a means of remiſſion of ſins, or of eternal life, but ſomething of duty, choice and ſanctity is joyn'd with it, in order to the production of the end ſo mentioned.*

3ly, *They that baptize children make Baptiſm to be wholy an outward duty, a work of the law, a carnal ordinance, it makes us adhere to the letter, without regard of the ſpirit, and to relinquiſh the myſteriouſneſſe, the ſubſtance, the ſpirituality of the Goſpel, which Argument is of ſo much the more conſideration, becauſe under the ſpiritual Covenant, or the*

Gospel of grace. If the mystery goes not before the Symbol (which it doth, when the Symboles are consignations of grace, as the Sacraments are) yet it always accompanies it, but never follows in order of time; and is cleare in the perpetual Analogy of holy Scripture.

4. *That the words mentioned in St.* Peters *sermon* Acts. 2. *which are the only Records of the promises) are interpreted upon a weak mistake: the promise belongs to you and your children, therefore Infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity: That is the Argument, but the reason of it is not yet discovered nor ever will, for (to you and your children) is to you, and your posterity, to you; and your children when they are of the same capacity, in which you are, receptive of the promise, but he that whenever the word children is expreſt, understands Infants, must needs believe that in all* Israel *there were no men but all were Infants,* &c.

5. *From the action of Christ blessing infants, to infer, that they were Baptized, proves nothing so much, as that there is want of better Arguments: for the conclusion would with more probability be derived thus——Christ blessed Children, and so dismissed them, but baptized them not: Therefore Infants are not to be baptized. But let this be as weake as its enemy; yet that Christ did not Baptize them, is an Argument sufficient that he hath other ways of bringing them to heaven then by Baptism. And we are sure God hath not commanded infants to be baptized, so we are sure God will do them no injustice, nor damn them for what they cannot help,* viz. *if the parents baptize them not.*

Many

Many theuſand ways there are by which God can bring any reaſonable ſoul to himſelf; but nothing is ſo unreaſonable, becauſe he hath tyed all men of years of diſcretion to this way, therefore we of our own heads ſhall carry Infants to him that way without his direction: The conceit is poor and low, and the action conſequent to it bold and venturous. Let him do what he pleaſes with infants, we muſt not.

Then Mr. Baxter *ſaith, if there can be no example given in Scripture of any one that was baptized without the profeſſion of a ſaving faith, nor any precept for ſo doing; then muſt we not baptize any without it: But the Antecedent is true: therefore ſo is the Conſequent.*

2. *Chriſt hath inſtituted no Baptiſm but what is to be a ſign of preſent Regeneration; but to men that profeſſe not a juſtifying faith, it cannot be adminiſtred as a ſign of preſent Regeneration; therefore he hath inſtituted no Baptiſm to be adminiſtred to ſuch.*

3. *If it be the appointed uſe of all Chriſtian Baptiſm to ſolemnize our Mariage with Chriſt, or to ſeal and confirm our union with him; then muſt we baptize none that profeſs not juſtifying faith; but the Antecedent and conſequent are evident,* Gal. 3. 27. 28. 29.

Doctor *Hammond* ſaith, that *all men were inſtructed in the fundamentalls of faith anciently before they were permitted to be baptized.*

The Lord *Brookes* ſaith; *That the analogy which Baptiſm now hath with Circumciſion in the old law, is a fine rational Argument to illuſtrate a point well proved before: But I ſomewhat doubt, whether it*

be proof enough for that which some would prove by it, since (besides the vast difference in the ordinance) the persons to be Circumcised are stated by a positive law, so express, that it leaves no place for scruple: But it is far otherwise in Baptism, where all the Designation of persons fit to be partakers, for ought I know are such as believe, &c.

Pæd. But Mr. *Wills*, and others say, that Doctor *Taylor* did but personate an Anabaptist, he himself was for Infants Baptism, only he gave some weak Arguments to please the Baptists.

Bap. Its true Mr. *Wills* and others say so: But must it needs be as they suppose? Does it follow infallibly that the Doctor does prevaricate in his first book? is it not possible that he might be under some measure of conviction, and so receded from the opinion he was once perswaded of, and fell from that truth he so strenuously contended for? The *Galatians* once received the Gospel, but were so foolish as to fall from it. Besides how frequently do we find divers of the fathers contradict themselves, and to build again the things that they destroyd? But we need not go so far: Mr. *Baxter* himself is a famous instance: How often do's Mr. *Baxter* contradict Mr. *Baxter*? and is it impossible Doctor *Taylor* should do so.

But you'l say he wrote another book, wherein he submitted to the Judgment of the Church in the matter of Baptism. Its very like he did, and perhaps he was of the opinion of a Popish-priest who told me; *There was indeed no Scripture for baptizing infants, but yet it ought to be done, because the Church commanded it. He spake what many think.*

But

But ſuppoſe the Doctor did, as you ſay, only perſonate an Anabaptiſt, and make uſe of ſome weak Arguments to pleaſe them. Then,

1. I wonder Mr. *Wills* or ſome other have not anſwered the Doctors weak Arguments all this while; for none that ever I heard of durſt enter the liſts with the Doctor in the matter: And to ſay, he did it by his contrary practiſe, is a frivolous anſwer.

2. But ſecondly, grant all to be true that you would have, and that the Doctor was not againſt baptizing infants (which we grant) nor Mr. *Baxter*, nor Doctor *Hammond*, &c. Yet we make uſe of their Arguments to a very good purpoſe, *viz.* to ſet off the wiſdom, goodneſſe, and power of God, who as he hath the hearts of all men in his hands; ſo alſo their tongues, and can, when he pleaſes, make uſe of them to bear witneſs to, and proclaim that truth, they neither owned, nor practiſed; as in the caſe of the High-prieſt, who prophecied, that *it was expedient, one ſhould die for the people*: ſo we ſay, God hath over-ruled the tongues and pens of Doctor *Taylor*, Mr. *Baxter* &c. and made them to bear ſo famous a Teſtimony to his truth, and ſtrike ſo deadly a wound to Infants Baptiſm, that whoever ſhall go about to heal it, will prove themſelves phiſitians of no value.

Pæd. But pray Sir what do you ſay to *Rom.* 11. 16. *If the firſt fruit be holy, the lump is holy; and if the root be holy, ſo are the branches.* From whence, we are told, this inference may be drawn, that as *Abraham* (conſidered as a root was holy, ſo

were

were his children and ſo to be Circumciſed. So Believers being holy, their Children are ſo, and ſo to be Baptized.

Bap. There hath been enough ſaid to ſhew the fallacy of this conſequence: But that you may have no cauſe to complain, I ſhall ſpeak further to it; firſt, then you muſt know, that the Apoſtles purpoſe is to ſhew what *Abraham* was heretofore, a holy root to his natural ſeed; but you will not ſay, he is ſo now; and that his children after the fleſh are ſtill holy, for they are cut off: And that he is not a holy root to the Infants of believing Gentiles, and that they are none of his branches, is abundantly proved: but if you ſay he is a holy root to believers, his ſpiritual ſeed, and they are holy; then we are agreed. For ſurely the Apoſtle intends nothing elſe, but that as *Abraham* was a two-fold father, ſo he had a two-fold ſeed; ſo he is a two-fold root, and hath two ſorts of branches.

His firſt ſort of branches were holy with a typical ceremonial holyneſs; his ſecond ſort are holy by believing as he did, and walking in his ſteps. But to purſue your conſequence a little further; that a believer (conſidered as a root) being holy, ſo his ſeed is holy, as of old it was with *Abraham*.

Then you muſt prove, that what was promiſed to *Abraham*, and what was his priviledge; juſt ſo it is with believers and their ſeed, and herein we expect plain Scripture proof, and not forced conſequences, and groundleſſe *non ſequiturs*.

But Secondly; If the natural ſeed of believers be

be holy, what kinde of holy neſſe is it? ſurely you do not mean moral holyneſſe which is oppoſed to ſin, and that they have ſome inward quality, inherent habit, or principle of grace in them, more then unbelievers infants.

Secondly, you do not mean negative holyneſſe, for there is as much alſo of that in unbelievers infants as in yours. But,

Thirdly, perhaps you mean a Covenant holyneſſe; but what kinde of holyneſſe that is, we could never yet learn from you.

But if believers natural ſeed be holy, with a Covenant holyneſſe, as *Abrahams* were; then you muſt baptiſe all their childrens children in their ſeveral generations (as you have heard) whether their parents believe or not; as it was of old: *Abrahams* branches, yea all his branches were holy to the 3d, and 4th, yea the 10th. generation, and ſo muſt yours be, and ſo to be baptized; If the Grandfather or great-grandfather were, or further removed: he was the root and his poſterity are the branches, as well as his immediate infants, and ſo to be baptized. And if you ſay 'tis hard to finde whether their progenitors were believers ſo far remote; then 'tis but going a ſtep higher to *Noah*; and his faith will ſerve to Baptiſe the whole world, for *Noah* conſidered as a believer is as well a root as *Abraham*.

But that there is no kinde of holyneſſe in the natural ſeed of believers more then in the ſeed of unbelievers now under the Goſpel appears from theſe Arguments.

1. If there be no perſons in the dayes of the Goſpel,

Gospel, to be accounted common or unclean, that is unholy (by nature) more then others; then there are no persons to be accounted clean or holy (by nature) more then others: but the antecedent is true, *Act.* 10. 28. *God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean*: Ergo so is the consequent.

But they that baptise Infants break the command of God to *Peter*, by counting the children of unbelievers common and unclean, and the children of believers clean or holy.

But if the children of believers be holy with any kinde of holynesse above others: Then the children of unbelievers are unholy, with some kinde of unholinesse more then others, and so to be accounted common and unclean.

But this is not so, for believers children *are by nature children of wrath as well as others*, as your selves confesse. Therefore, call nothing, no men, or species of men, common or unclean; for in every nation, he that fears God and works righteousnesse shall be accepted. Observe, divine acceptation comes in upon the account of actual and personal righteousnesse; no persons nor their seed are now accepted for the holynesse of another (rather then others.)

2*ly*, If God be now no respecter of persons, then there is no birth holynesse, and so no peculiar priviledges belongs to believers natural seed by Gods appointment, more then to the seed of unbelievers: but the first is true *Act.* 10. *I perceive saith* Peter, *that God is no respecter of persons*: therefore, so is the latter.

And

And that *Peter* meant this of birth holyneſſe, and natural priviledges is evident, becauſe he mentions this as the reſult of his viſion, where he was forbid to count any man common or unclean that is, more then others by nature, for God is no reſpecter of perſons. Its true all men are (by nature) common and unclean, in oppoſition to moral cleanefs, and Goſpel-holineſs: but no ſort of perſons are by nature clean, or holy, with any kinde of ceremonial, dedicative, or Covenant holyneſſe above others. But,

3. If there be a Covenant holyneſſe now, in the days of the Goſpel, flowing from the root to the branches; then God would rather have continued his Church in the poſterity of believers (as of old); but he hath not done ſo; therefore there is no ſuch holyneſſe.

We read in the Second of the *Acts.* of 3000. *baptized*, and afterwards 5000. The greateſt part of which were believers, and the 7 Churches of *Aſia*; and (as you ſay) their children holy, with a Covenant holyneſſe: It is ſtrange then the Church was not continued in their poſterity: but it was not, for I ſuppoſe it is hard, if not impoſſible to finde any one of their off-ſpring a member of any true Church in the world.

So the Church of *Rome*, once a true Church: But you do not count the preſent Church ſo. why? they had believing parents, who were in Covenant, and their ſeed holy, yet God did not think fit to continue them a true Church any long time; But hath rather raiſed his Church out of the poſterity of unbelievers, and longer continued them

them. As in this nation; our progenitors were all Idolaters as the *Brittains*, *Romans*, *Saxons*, *Danes*, and *Normans*; The off-ſpring of ſome of whom we are: yet God hath continued his Church amongſt us a very conſiderable time. But if we boaſt of our Covenant holyneſs and birth priviledges, God may ſoon unchurch us, and raiſe up Church members out of ſtones, as *John the Baptiſt* told the Phariſees.

4ly. There is no ſuch Covenant holyneſs under the Goſpel; becauſe that holyneſſe was a Typical Ceremonial holyneſſe; ſuch as was in beaſts, birds, Garments, oyl, the Altar, temple, yea in the whole land, and therefore called *Emanuels* land, and no other kind of holyneſs was in the ſeed: (let Pedo-Baptiſts ſay what they will) all which holyneſs is now aboliſhed and done away, and that appears thus.

If all uncleaneſs, and unholyneſs that was in ſome beaſts, birds, garments, oyl, Altars, Temples, and men *&c.* be now aboliſhed and done away; then all that cleaneſs and holyneſs that was in ſome beaſts, birds, garments, men *&c.* is alſo aboliſhed, and done away: But the Antecedent is true *Act.* 10. as appears by *Peters* viſion; *what God hath cleanſed, call not thou common or unclean*, Ergo, ſo is the Conſequent.

And that there was an uncleaneſs, commoneſs, and unholyneſs in ſome men, as well as in beaſts, birds *&c.* is evident: For it was not lawfull for a Jew to eat with him that was a Gentile. But now it is not ſo——*If an unbeliever invite thee to a feaſt, if thou beeſt diſpoſed thou maieſt go.* 1 *Cor.* 10. 25.

And

And that all this Typical, dedicative denominative holyneſs is now aboliſhed appears further;

Becauſe that holyneſs that ſanctifyed the Jews land, City, Temple *&c.* was Ceremonial only, and ſo aboliſhed; but that holyneſs which ſanctifyed the ſeed was the ſame and no other, that ſanctifyed the land: therefore that holyneſs which ſanctifyed the ſeed is now aboliſhed.

And if it be ſaid, that the holyneſs of the ſeed was not typical and Ceremonial, I prove it thus.

1. If all things under the law were but a figure, and ſhaddow of good things to come; then the holyneſs of the ſeed was but a figure and ſhadow of good things to come; And ſo a type.

But the Antecedent is true, as we find in the *9th. and 10th. Chapters of the Hebrews*; where all things under the law, all the priviledges of the old Covenant, all the perquiſites, dependances and appurtenances are called by ſuch names, as make them evidently appear to be Typical: as firſt they are called a figure *Heb.* 9. 9. *which was a figure for the time then preſent.* So *verſe* 24. *For Chriſt is not entred into the holy place made with hands, which are the figures of the true.*

They are called a patern *Heb.* 9. 23. *It was neceſſary that the paterns of the things in the heavens &c.*

3. They are called a ſhaddow *Heb.* 10. 1. *for the law having a ſhaddow of good things to come, and not the very Image of the things.*

So then the holyneſs of the ſeed being a dependance, an appurtenance, a priviledge of the law, or old Covenant was but a figure, patern, ſhadow,

dow; and so Typical, and abolished.

And if you say, if the holyness of the seed was a Type; what did it tipify? I answer:

1. First it typifyed the holyness of Christ who is called the *holy child Jesus.*

2. It was a type of the holyness of all *Abrahams* spiritual seed under the Gospel, true believers, who are made holy by believing in Christ.

Pæd. But we have heard that when the Jews were broken off, their natural Children were broken off with them; so when the Gentiles are grafted in, their Children are grafted in with them.

Bap. You have heard that the children of the unbelieving Jews was not so broken off from the Gospel Church and covenant, and excluded with their parents unbelief, for if any of the children of the unbelieving Jews when they come to years (and children when at years are the seed of their parents, I hope) if I say, those unbelieving Jews children do believe the promise is so made to them, that their parents unbelief cannot exclude them: but if when at years they do not believe, the promise is so made to believers and their seed, as that the parents faith, avails no further then to the ingrafting of himself; but he cannot at all entitle his natural seed, by his single faith to the Gospel Covenant or ordinances: For if it be otherwise, then the natural seed of those thousands of Jews that were converted in the primitive times, have a birth priviledge, and are holy to this day, upon which they may claim admittance

ance unto baptiſm as well as any; for they may plead as you do and ſay. Baptiſm is our right, we are the poſterity of thoſe believing Jews mentioned *Act.* 2. And *if the firſt fruits be holy, ſo is the lump, & if the root be holy, ſo are the branches.* Now we are the lump of theſe holy firſt fruits; and the branches of the holy root; yet for all this I believe you would not Baptize them, unleſſe they did believe in their own perſons. By which you do no leſſe then grant what we contend for: that the faith of Anceſtors gives no right to their poſterity, to ſtand at all in the Goſpel Church and Covenant, but faith in the particular perſons. So that the Jews were broken off by unbelief; and thou and thine (O believing Gentile) muſt ſtand by faith. Yet not thy ſeed by thy faith, but thou, thy ſelf, by thine, and they by their own faith. Faith is that by which (thou ſtanding, and not thy ſeed) haſt right to ſtand in the Church, and not they. But if thy ſeed have faith, and thou haſt none, they have right to ſtand in the Church, and thou ſhalt be kept out. By which it appears, that the root may be holy (in a Goſpel ſence) and not the branches, and the branches may be holy, and not the root: ſo that your conſequence from *Rom.* 11. 16. *if the root be holy, ſo are the branches,* is falſe, and the whole Argument vain and empty.

And if you ſtill ſay (for nothing will ſatisfy ſome perſons) that the natural ſeed may be counted holy, with a denominative, and dedicative holyneſſe: I anſwer.

1. That then the firſt born of every creature both of man & beaſt is ſtill to be called and coun-

ted holy; for these were sanctifyed and holy by dedication as well as the seed. *Sanctify unto me all the first born of every creature both of man and beast*, they are still to be called and counted holy, for these were sanctifyed, and holy by dedication as well as the seed. See *Exod.* 13. 2. *Sanctify unto me all the first born, whatsoever openeth the womb, amongst the children of* Israel, *both of man and beast, it is mine.* So that you may as well dedicate the first born still, and count them holyer then the rest, yea and that with better warrant then you can count the seed of believers, only, holy, because (as you say) you dedicate them to God; there being an institution for the first, but none for the last; For God no where saith, that believers shall sanctify all their natural seed, whatsoever openeth the womb, for it is mine.

2*ly*. If the seed be to be accounted holy with a dedicative holynesse, then you may as well count all things holy which were dedicated of old, as Temples, Altars, Tables, Garments, Tapers, Candlesticks, yea the very windows, Fonts, Rails, Copes, Surplices, *&c.* But this you deny, and have laboured hard both by pen and pulpit to make these holy things unholy: Though those that own this dedicative holynesse still have more to say for Infant-Baptism, then you who disown it in all things else but in the natural seed.

But pray Sirs let me ask you a few questions.

1. *Si aliquando, quare non nunc?* If so once, why not now? If under the law, why not under the Gospel? The same question you put to us when we deny any birth holynesse in your fleshly seed.

ſeed. So we ſay concerning Temples, Altars, Garments, &c. *Si aliquando, quare non nunc?* If ſo of old, why not now?

2ly, *Si aliquid, quare non quicquid?* If any thing holy with a dedicative ceremonial holyneſſe, why not every thing? yea, *quare non æqualiter?* (if you will Judaize) why not in every thing alike, as it was of old? but I may expect an anſwer *ad Græcas Calendas.*

Pæd. But Sir may not Infants be capable of the main and principal end of Baptiſm, which our Miniſters tells us is the waſhing away our ſins by the blood of *Chriſt?* If ſo, why may they not then be baptized?

Bap. There are not wanting learned men that are of another opinion, and ſay that the blood of Chriſt is not the main thing ſignified in Baptiſm, but that Baptiſm is a ſigne of our Regeneration; and that is the principal end of Baptiſm. And herein I will give you the opinion of Judicious and learned Mr. *Mede* upon that text *Tit.* 3. 5. *By the waſhing of Water and renewing of the holy Ghoſt*, and ſhall beg the Readers patience to read his entire ſence upon that text. He ſaith thus.

The words, as it is eaſy to conceive, upon the firſt hearing are ſpoken of Baptiſm, of which I intend not by this choice to make any full or accurate tractation; but only to acquaint you with my thoughts concerning two particulars therein: one, from what propriety, analogy, or uſe of water, the waſhing therewith was inſtituted for a ſigne of new birth, according as it is here called λουτρον παλιγγενεσιας *the waſhing of Regeneration. The other, what is*

the Countertype or thing which the water figureth in this Sacrament.

I will begin with the laſt firſt, becauſe the knowledge thereof muſt be ſuppoſed for the explication and more diſtinct underſtanding of the other. In every Sacrament as ye well know, there is the outward Symbol or ſigne, res terrena, *and the* ſignatum *figured and repreſented thereby,* res Cæleſtis. *In this of Baptiſm the ſigne, or* res terrena, *is waſhing with water: the queſtion is what is the* ſignatum, *the inviſible and celeſtial thing, which anſwers thereunto. In our Catechetical explications of this myſtery, it is wont to be affirmed to be the blood of Chriſt; that as water waſheth away the filth of the body, ſo the blood of Chriſt cleanſeth us from the guilt and pollution of ſin. And there is no queſtion but the bloud of Christ is the fountain of all the grace and good communicated to us, either in this or any other Sacrament, or miſtery of the Goſpel. But that this ſhould be the* ἀντίτυπον, *the counter part, or thing figured by the water in Baptiſm I believe not, becauſe the Scriptnre, which muſt be our guide, and direction in this caſe, makes it another thing, to wit, the ſpirit or holy Ghoſt; this to be that, whereby the ſoul is cleanſed and renewed within, as the body with water is without; ſo ſayth our Saviour to* Nicodemus in John. 3. Except a man be born of water, and the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. *And the Apoſtle in the words I have read, parallels the waſhing of regeneration, and the renewing of the holy Ghoſt, as Type and Countertype.* God (*ſaith he*) hath ſaved us (*that is brought us into the ſtate of ſalvation*) by the waſhing of regeneration, and

the

the renewing of the holy Ghoſt : *Where none, I trow, will deny that he ſpeaks of Baptiſm. The ſame was repreſented by that viſion at our Saviours baptiſm, of the holy Ghoſts deſcending upon him, as he came out of the water, in the ſimilitude of a dove : For I ſuppoſe, that in that Baptiſm of his, the Miſtery of all our Baptiſms was viſibly acted ; and that God ſays to every one, truly baptized, as he ſaid to him,* (*in a proportionable ſenſe*) thou art my ſon, in whom I am well pleaſed.

And how pliable the Analogy of water is to typifie the ſpirit, will appear by the figuring of the ſpirit thereby in other places of Scripture; as in that of Iſay, I will pour water upon him that is thirſty, and flouds upon the dry ground : I will pour my ſpirit upon thy ſeed, and my bleſſing upon thine offſpring, *where the later expounds the former : Alſo by the diſcourſe of our Saviour with the Samaritan woman,* John 4. 14. Whoſoever (*ſaith he*) drinketh of the water that I ſhall give him, ſhall never thirſt, but the water that I ſhall give him ſhall be in him a well of water ſpringing up to everlaſting life : *By that alſo,* John 7. 37. *where on the laſt day of the great feaſt, Jeſus ſtood and ſaid,* If any man thirſt let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture ſaith (*that is, as the Scripture is wont to expreſſe it, for otherwiſe there is no ſuch place of Scripture to be found in all the Bible*) out of his belly ſhall flow rivers of living water. *But this* (*ſaith the Evangeliſt*) *he ſpake of the ſpirit, which they that believe on him ſhould receive. Nor did the fathers or ancient Church, as far as I can find ſuppoſe any other correlative*

lative to the element in baptiſm, but this; of this the ſpeak often, of the bloud of Chriſt they are altogether ſilent in their explications of this miſtery: many are the alluſions, they ſeek out for the illuſtration thereof, and ſome perhaps forced, but this of the water, ſignifying, or having any relation to the bloud of Chriſt, never comes amongſt them, which were impoſſible, if they had not ſuppoſed ſome other thing figured by the water, then it; which barred them from falling on that conceit.

The like ſilence is to be obſerved in our Liturgy, where the holy Ghoſt is more then once paralleld with the water in baptiſm, waſhing and regeneration attributed thereunto; but no ſuch notion of the bloud of Chriſt; and that the opinion thereof is novel, may be gathered, becauſe ſome Lutheran Divines make it peculiar and proper to the followers of Cal in.

Whatſoever it be, it hath no foundation in Scripture, and we muſt not of our own heads aſſign ſignifications to Sacramental types without ſome warrant thence. For whereas ſome conceive thoſe two expreſſions of ῥαντισμὸς or ſprinkling of the bloud of Chriſt, *and of our being waſhed from our ſins in (or by) his bloud, do intimate ſome ſuch matter, they are ſurely miſtaken; for thoſe expreſſions have reference not to the water of Baptiſm in the new Teſtament, but to the rite and manner of ſacrificing in the old; where the Altar was wont to be ſprinkled with the bloud of the ſacrifices, which were offered, and that which was unclean purified with the ſame bloud: Whence is that elegant diſcourſe of S.* Paul, (Heb. 9.) *comparing the ſacrifice of the law, with that of Chriſt upon the Croſſe, as much the better.*

much

And that whereas in the law, σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται, Almoſt all things are purified with bloud, *ſo much more the bloud of Chriſt, who offered himſelf without ſpot to God, cleanſeth our conſciences from dead works: but that this waſhing, that is, cleanſing by the bloud of Chriſt, ſhould have reference to baptiſm, where is that to be found? I ſuppoſe they will not alledge the water and bloud, which came out of our Saviours ſide, when they pierced him; for that is taken to ſignify the two Sacraments ordained by Chriſt, that of bloud, the Euchariſt; of water, baptiſm; and not both to be referred to baptiſm: I add, becauſe perhaps ſome mens fancies are corrupted therewith, that there was no ſuch thing as ſprinkling, or* ῥαντισμὸς *uſed in baptiſm in the Apoſtles times, nor many ages after them; and that therefore it is no way probable, that* ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος Χριστοῦ *in* Peter *ſhould have any reference to the laver of baptiſm.*

Let this then be our concluſion; that the bloud of Chriſt concurrs in the miſtery of baptiſm, by way of efficacy and merit, but not as the thing there figured; which the Scripture tells us not to be the bloud of Chriſt, but the ſpirit.

And ſo I come to my other Quære, from what property or uſe of water, the waſhing therewith is a Sacrament of our new birth, for ſo it is here called the waſhing of Regeneration; & our Saviour ſays to Nicodemus, except a man be born of water, and the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. *For in every Sacrament there ſome Analogy between what is outwardly done, and what is thereby ſignified: therefore in this. But what ſhould it be?*

It is a thing of some moment, and yet in the tractats of this mistery, but little or seldom enquired after; and therefore deserves the more consideration. I answer, this analogy between the washing with water, and regeneration lies in that custome of washing infants from the pollutions of the womb, when they are first born, for this is the first office done unto them when they come out of the womb, if they purpose to nourish and bring them up. As therefore in our natural birth, the body is washt with water from the pollutions wherewith it comes into the world: so in our second birth from above, the soul is purified by the spirit from the guilt and pollution of sin, to begin a new life to God-ward.

The Analogy you see is apt and proper, if that be true of the Custome whereof there is no cause to make question; for the use at present, any man, I think, knows how to inform himself. For that of elder times, I can produce two pregnant and notable testimonies; one of the Jews and people of God; another of the Gentiles. The first you shall finde in the 16. *Chapter of* Ezekiel, *where God describes the poor and forlorn condition of* Jerusalem, *when he first took her to himself, under the parable of an exposed Infant*; As for thy Nativity, (*saith he*) in the day thou wast born, thy navel was not cut, neither wast thou washed in water, to supple thee; thou wast not salted at all, nor swadled at all, no eye pitied thee, none to do any of these things unto thee, to have compassion on thee; but thou wast cast out in open field, to the loathing of thy person in the day that thou wast born. *Here you may learn what was wont to be done unto*

infants

infants at their nativity, by that which was not done to Iſrael, *till God himſelf took pitty on her, cutting of the Navel ſtring, waſhing, ſalting, ſwadling: upon this place, S.* Hierome *takes notice (but ſcarce any body elſe, that I can yet finde) that our Saviour, where ſpeaking of Baptiſm he ſays,* Except a man be born of water and the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; *alludes to the cuſtome here mentioned of waſhing Infants at their Nativity.*

The other teſtimony (and that moſt pertinent to the application we make) I finde in a ſtory related by Plutarch, *in his* Quæſtiones Romanæ, *not far from the beginning, in this manner.*

Among the Greeks, if one that were living were reported to be dead and funeral obſequies performed for him, if afterwards he returned alive, he was of all men abominated, as a prophane and unlucky perſon; No man would come into his company, and (which was the higheſt degree of calamity) they excluded him from their Temples, and the ſacrifices of their Gods: it chanced that one Ariſtinus *being fallen into the like diſaſter, and not knowing which way to expiate himſelf therefrom, ſent to the Oracle at* Delphos *to* Apollo, *beſeeching him to ſhew him the means whereby he might be freed and diſcharged thereof;* Pythia *gave him this Anſwer.*

Ὅσα περ ἐν λεχέεσσι γυνὴ τίκτουσα τελεῖτο,
ταῦτα πάλιν τελέσαντα θύειν μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι.

What women do, when one in childbed lyes,
That do again, ſo maiſt thou ſacrifice.

Ariſtinus *rightly apprehending what the Oracle meant, offered himſelf to women, as one newly brought*

fourth

forth to be waſhed again with water ; from which Example it grew a cuſtome among the Greeks, *when the like misfortune befell any man, after this manner to expiate them ; they called them* Hyſteropotmi, *or* Poſtliminio nati : *How well doth this befit the myſtery of Baptiſm ? where thoſe who were dead to God through ſin are like* Hyſteropotmi, *regenerate and born again by water, and the holy Ghoſt.*

Theſe two paſſages diſcover ſufficiently the Analogy of the waſhing with water in Baptiſm, to regeneration or new birth ; according as the text, I have choſen for the Scope of my diſcourſe, exppeſſeth it ; namely, that waſhing with water is a ſigne of ſpiritual Infancy ; *for as much as Infants are wont to be waſhed, when they came firſt into the world.*

Hence the Jews before Ionn *the Baptiſt came amongſt them, were wont by this rite to initiate ſuch, as they made Proſelytes, (to wit) as becoming Infants again, and entring into a new life and being, which before they had not. That, which here I have affirmed, will be yet more evident, if we conſider thoſe other rites anciently added and uſed in the celebration of this myſtery, which had the ſelf ſame end we ſpeak of ; to wit, to ſignify ſpiritual Infancy. I will name them, and ſo conclude ; as that of giving the new baptized milk and hony,* ad infantandum, *as* Tertullian *ſpeaks,* ad infantiæ ſignificationem, *ſo S.* Hierome ; *becauſe the like was uſed to Infants New born ; according to that in the 7th. of* Iſay. *of* Immanuels *infancy* ; A virgin ſhall conceive and bear a ſon, butter and honey ſhall he eat, that he may know to refuſe evil and chooſe good. *Secondly, that of Salt, as is implyed in that of*

Ezekiel,

Ezekiel, thou wast not washed with water, nor salted with salt: *That of putting on the white garment, to resemble swadling: all these were anciently (especially the first) used in the Sacrament of our spiritual birth, out of reference to that which was done to Infants at their natural birth: who then can doubt but the principal rite of washing with water, the only one ordained by our blessed Saviour, was chosen for the same reason? to be the element of our Initiation; and that those who brought in the other, did so conceive of this; and from thence derived those imitations.*

Thus for *Mr. Mede*. From whom we learn these truths.

1. That it not lawful to assigne significations to sacramental Types (of our own heads) without warrant from the Scriptures.

2. That in every Sacrament there is the signe, and the thing signified, *res terrena, & res cælestis.*

3. That in Baptism there is an Invisible and cælestial thing signified.

4. That though the blood of Christ is the fountain and cause of all that grace and good we receive in Baptism, yet it is not the thing signified by the water in Baptism; but the spirit cleansing the soul from sin in the work of Regeneration, according to *Tit.* 3. 5.

5. That in the Baptism of Christ the mistery of all our Baptism was visibly acted.

6. That God says to every one (truly Baptized (as he said to Christ (in a proportionable sence) *thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased.*

That

7. That there is a plain Analogy between water and the ſpirit, confirmed by divers Scriptures: But not ſo, between the water in Baptiſm, and the blood of Chriſt.

8. That the Fathers and primitive Church did not ſuppoſe any other correlative to the water in Baptiſm, but the ſpirit, though they did allude to Chriſts blood for illuſtration thereof.

9. That in our Liturgy the water in Baptiſm, is made to ſignifie the holy ſpirit in our Regeneration: But not the Blood of Chriſt.

10. That there was no ſuch thing as ῥαντισμὸς or ſprinkling uſed in the Apoſtles times, nor many ages after.

11. That the Analogy between waſhing with water in Baptiſm, and Regeneration, appears from the cuſtome of waſhing infants from the pollutions of the womb, when firſt born, according to the practice of Jews and Gentiles.

12. That the Fathers and ancient Church did uſe to give the new baptized Milk and honey, and put white garments on them, to ſignify their *ſpiritual birth*, out of reference to that which was done to infants at their natural birth.

From all which you ſee that baptiſm is not ſo much a ſign of purging our ſins by the bloud of Chriſt; though that concurs by way of merit and efficacy, but is not the thing there ſignifi'd or figured: & then to what purpoſe are infants baptized?

Thus you ſee how this learned man (ere he was aware) hath ſpoyl'd Infant-Baptiſm: for if baptiſm be a ſymbol of regeneration (as undoubtedly it is) then unleſs you ſay (and that from

from Scripture grounds) that your infants are regenerated, or ſeem ſo to be, baptiſm doth not at all belong to them.

And it will no ways help you to ſay, that the Baptiſts do baptize ſome perſons that are not regenerated; for it is enough to warrant our practiſe, if they profeſs ſo to be; and give us thoſe Scripture characters, *i.e.* actuall faith, and Repentance.

Pœd. But pray Sir what think you of the Covenant made to *Abraham* and his natural ſeed, what kind of Covenant was it?

Bap. I confeſs there are various opinions about it; ſome ſay it was a Covenant of grace; others, a Covenant of works, others, a mixt Covenant: But ſurely that Covenant made with *Abraham*, and his natural ſeed called the Covenant of Circumciſion, or Covenant of the Law was not the Covenant of Eternal life and ſalvation, which was made with all the elect in Chriſt upon the condition of faith: but a diſtinct Covenant of it ſelf concerning the worſhip and ſervice of God, and ſo may be called a Covenant of works, rather then a Covenant of grace; though there was alſo grace in it, as there was in all the Covenants that God ever made with men——yet we ſay, it was a diſtinct Covenant, and therefore called the old Covenant, and the Covenant of grace the new Covenant.

And if you ſay the Covenant of grace was the ſame in all ages under various adminiſtrations, we confeſs it, and ſay that the Covenant of grace was made to *Adam* after the fall, to the *Patriarchs*,

archs, and to *Abraham*, before the Covenant of Circumcision was mentioned, and is the same to us now. But, as ours, its called new, (or renewed) yet it doth not follow, but this Covenant of Circumcision was a distinct Covenant still; for *Abraham* and all believers in that age, were in the Covenant of grace before this Covenant was made; and would have been so, if the Covenant of Circumcision had never been. And if you demand then, why the Covenant of works is called the old Covenant, and the Covenant of grace, the new?

1. I answer, because of its priority, it being the first Covenant God made with man before the fall, as Protestant Divines say; that God made a Covenant of works with *Adam*, concerning perfect obedience, which he had then power to perform. And some think God renewed this Covenant of works after the fall, as appears by the sacrifices that *Adam*, *Abel*, &c. offered; and from that Scripture, if thou dost well, shalt not thou be accepted; if not, sin lyes at the door. And afterwards this Covenant of works or Covenant concerning worship is renewed to *Abraham*, and his posterity.

2. It is called the old Covenant in respect to its deteriority, it being a Covenant found fault with, as the Scripture saith.

3. In respect to its decaying and perishing nature; it was not durable or lasting, as the Apostle saith, *that which decayeh and waxeth old is ready to perish, meaning this Covenant.*——And the Covenant of grace is called the new Covenant.

First,

Firſt, becauſe of its meliority, or bitterneſs, it is more excellent, as the new heavens and the new earth that God will make will be more excellent then the old.

2. In oppoſition to the old, as appears *Heb.* 8. 8. *when God ſays he will make a new Covenant*, he adds, *not according to the Covenant, when I brought your fathers out of Egipt*, which was by virtue of the Covenant made with *Abraham*.

3. In reſpect to its perpetuity and duration, it is the everlaſting Covenant: the Covenant made with *Abraham* and his natural ſeed is vaniſhed and done away, but this remains, as the Apoſtle ſays: *if that which was done away was glorious, how much more that which remains*. That which was done away was the old Covenant, or Covenant made with *Abraham*, and his natural ſeed with all the priviledges of it. And that which remains is the new Covenant, or promiſe of eternal life made in *Jeſus* to all believers.

4. It is called the new Covenant, as to us, becauſe renewed in a more Goſpel and glorious manner. So that we are indeed ſtill under the ſame Covenant of grace made with *Adam* and all the partriarchs: but not under the ſame Covenant of works made with *Abraham* and his natural ſeed.

But further, that you may know what the Covenant made with *Abraham* was, take the opinion of a late learned Author

The old Covenant (ſaith he) was a political Covenant made with the Jews, as Princes compacts are with their people when they firſt ſet up Government: God promiſes them his protection, and that he would lead

lead them to a fruitful land, overcome all their enemies, &c. *with the like blessings. And they promise they will be ruled by him,* &c. *To this purpose did God in sundry ways appear to them,* To Moses, *to their elders, to them all in the cloud and fire, and then causes a Tabernacle to be made for him; which was a keeping house amongst them, where the sacrifices and offerings were his provisions, and the Priests his servants that lived on him. And unto that Tabernacle and Ark, might they repair for counsel and Judgment. This people then, being under a* Theocracy, *which* Samuel *does in two places expresly signify (at least unto the time of* Saul*) so that the Church and Common-wealth of the Jews were but one. It is no wonder if Religion be made their laws and so required of them together with other political Ordinances and statutes for their happinesse and publick peace as a nation.*

And though in their ceremonial offerings and Priests appointmens there was a remembrance still of sin; yet had they Types of Christ, of remedying mercy, and of the glory to come.

Their sacrifices as I have said serve to the maintenance of this house, the Tabernacle and Temple which he was pleased to keep up amongst them for a time, God indeed making use of these, for Types and representations of other things, that is to say spiritual, and so the law being a Pædagogy under a temporal dispensation, leading men to Christ. So far my Author.

But God hath quite pulled down this house, brake up house-keeping as we say, and turned the servants, Infants and all out of doors *Rom.* 11.

The

The natural branches are broken off——and *Heb.* 8. 13. *That which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vaniſh.* And ſaith the Apoſtle, *if that which was done away was glorious &c.* what was that but this old houſe with all the priviledges of it?

But now God hath built him a new houſe into which he hath admitted none as his houſhold ſervants but believers or ſuch as profeſs ſo to be. And theſe two houſes are mentioned *Heb.* 3. 2, 3, 4. where one is called *Moſes* his houſe, and the other *Chriſts* houſe: *As* Moſes *was faithful in all his houſe. For this man was accounted worthy of more honour then* Moſes; *in as much as he that hath builded the houſe, hath more honour, then the houſe.* Moſes *was faithful as a ſervant but Chriſt as a ſon over his own houſe, whoſe houſe are we, if we hold faſt the confidence* &c. where the ſervants are alſo deſcribed, they are belivers, not infants, hence they are alſo called *living ſtones*, and *a ſpiritual houſe* 1 *Pet.* 2. 3.

And that none but ſuch are of this houſhold appears, in that Chriſt the great Maſter of this houſe is compared to a king travelling into a far Country, who called his ſervants, (all his ſervants) and delivered unto them his goods, that is, *Certain Talents to improve Math.* 25. 14, 15. which cannot be ſuppoſed to be delivered to infants while they want the uſe of reaſon; for theſe talents are preſently to be *improv'd and laid out*, not laid up.

So again *Chriſt is compared to a houſe-keeper who made a great ſupper, and invited his gueſts*, but they were not infants, becauſe the firſt that were

invited made excuſes. The next are compeld to come in, which ſuppoſes an unwillingneſs in the parties, and that they were perſons capable to conſent or deny. The ſumme of all is, that the old houſe the Jewiſh Church, with all the appurtenances and priviledges of it, is pulled down, and a new one built, into which infants are not admitted, becauſe not invited nor appointed by any law. They were of the houſhold of old, but it was by a poſitive law; ſhew us the like now, or you ſay nothing. Sure I am there is no inſtitution that makes infants now fellow Citizens with the Saints, and of the houſhold of God: Neither are they ſo to be accounted till they believe, and are able to do ſervice in the houſe.

And if you ſay, that amongſt men, infants are counted of the houſhold though they can do no ſervice; I anſwer; that compariſon does not run upon four feet, it doth not follow, that, becauſe we count our infants of our family, therefore they are to be accounted members of Gods family, the Goſpel Church, unleſs God by any inſtitution had made them ſo. The houſhold of God is called the houſhold of faith; do good unto all, eſpecially the houſhold of faith; or a houſe conſiſting of believers: now, unleſs you prove your infants to be believers they are not of this houſe: For all the ſervants here muſt be believers either really, or Hiſtorically and profeſſedly, which infants cannot be. And it will not help you to ſay the Church was (or may be) called the houſhould of faith ſynecdochically, from the greateſt part; for it is evident all the materialls of the firſt

Churches

Churches were adult perſons, and profeſſed believers as appears by the narrative we have in the Acts of the Apoſtles, the direction of all the Epiſtles, and divers Scriptures. Beſides it may ſo happen that the infants may be the greateſt part of a Congregation, and then where is your houſhold of faith?

Pæd. But Mr. *Wills* tells us, that Mr. *Baxter* ſaith; *That Infant Church memberſhip did take place as an ordinance of God, before Circumciſion was enjoyned, or the Ceremonial law inſtituted, and why then ſhould it ceaſe with it? It was no part of the typical adminiſtration, but a moral inſtitution of God even from the beginning of the world. God ever made a diſtinction between the ſeed of the faithful and the ſeed of the wicked, as viſibly belonging to ſeveral kingdomes of God, and of Satan.* Mal. 2. 15. *Therefore they are called a holy ſeed.* Wills *pag.* 54.

Bap. Here is *vox & præterea nihil.* 'Tis true Mr. *Baxter* ſaith ſo; but if it be warrant enough for Mr. *Wills* to believe it, it is not for me. It is ſtrange, of what authority ſome mens words are when they have got the eſtimation of Orthodox and pious; and we have no great cauſe to wonder at the implicite faith of the Church of *Rome*, when an *ipſe dixit*, from an Engliſh oracle commands ſuch credit, and vaſſals us to their raw and undigeſted dictates. But let us examine this aſſertion.

He ſaith, *that Infant Church-memberſhip did take place as an ordinance of God, before Circumciſion &c.* But where is that ordinance? why are

we not directed to some place of Scripture where we may find it? Did God make Mr. *Baxter* of his Cabinet Councel, and reveal it to him, and no body else? Or in what Ancient father did he find it? Did any one ever say so before him?

2. He saith, *that it was no part of the typical Administration, but a moral institution of God* &c.

I answer; there hath been enough said to prove the fallacy and novelty of this position. Therefore I referr you to what hath been written. But he saith, *it is a moral institution.*——We still demand, where we shall find that institution, or else wee'l say, Mr. *Baxter* is wise above what is written.

3. He saith *God ever made a distinction between the seed of the faithful, and the seed of the wicked.*——But what distinction? Did God single them out, and separate them by any visible sign or character before the law of Circumcision? It is evidently known he did not.——Or did God distinguish them by his providential care of them, or provision for them more then others? The Scripture is silent as to this also.——Or did God love them with a saving love more then the children of unbelievers? This seems to be his meaning, because of his next words——*as visibly belonging to several kingdoms, of God, and Satan.*

But is it so? Did all the children of believers from *Adam* to *Abraham* belong to the kingdom of God? and all the children of unbelievers belong to the kingdom of the Devil? If it be Mr. *Baxters* Divinity, or M. *Wills* charity, it shall be none of mine. But he thinks to salve all with the word

word [*viſibly*] But pray when *the ſons of God took the Daughters of men, and all fleſh had corrupted its ways*, to what kingdom did they belong? Did not the ſeed of believers grow prophane and wicked, and the ſeed of unbelievers pious and Godly? as appears in divers, even *Abraham* himſelf, whoſe father was an Idolater, as is probably ſuppoſed (he himſelf being bred up in Idolatry) But Mr. *Baxter* hath ſome Scripture for his warrant, and it is *Mal.* 2. 15.——*that he might ſeek a godly ſeed*——But he that can find infants Church-memberſhip in this text, and that the ſeed of believers did always belong viſibly to the kingdom of God, and all others to the kingdom of the Devil——*erit mihi magnus Apollo.*

What though God ſays, *he that ſought a godly ſeed, therefore let none deal treacherouſly with the wife of his youth*; implying that children born in lawful wedlock are this Godly ſeed? Let none, whether believer or unbeliever——unleſs you hold, that children of unbelivers may not be a godly ſeed.

But theſe are ſuch *Non ſequiturs*, that it is in vain to ſpend further time about them.

So that the Morality of Infants Church-memberſhip is a very fancy. And that which Mr. *Baxter* drives at, can never be prov'd, *viz. that there was a lineal ſucceſſive conveyance of grace from the parent to the child*: If ſo, it is ſtrange that all fleſh ſhould ſo ſoon have corrupted its ways, that God ſaw cauſe to bring the flood upon the world of ungodly.

Surely had there been any ſuch Covenant ho-

lyneſs as the *Pædo-Baptiſts* dream of, before the flood; there would have been ſome godly ſociety, ſome greater number of believers to have been preſerv'd beſides *Noah* and his Family, who were not all godly neither; there was a *Cham* among them, which would not have been if there were ſuch a conveyance of grace and Covenant holyneſs from the Father to the ſon.

So that notwithſtanding what hath been ſaid, Infant Church-memberſhip came in with the law of Circumciſion, and went out and was repealed with it, as hath been abundantly proved For *when there was a change of the Prieſthood, there was a change of the law*, which muſt needs include Circumciſion with all the appurtenances and priviledges belonging to it.

Pæd. But what think you of that principle that ſome told, that Infants are Church-members before they are baptized? ſo Mr. *Wills* pag. 27. ſaith.

The firſt and chief end of Baptiſm is to be the initiating ſign and ſeal of Gods Covenant, and favour to us in Chriſt, and not to give an entrance or admiſſion into the Church. Unleſs perſons are to be reputed members of the Church, they are not to be baptized: For Baptiſm in its own nature is the ſeal of our being already ingrafted into Chriſt, and conſequently into the Church. For which he Quotes Dr. Ames. And pag. 45. *We deny* ſaith he, *that Baptiſm doth give Formality, or make a man a member of a viſible Church, though that Orthodox Divines have frequently termed Baptiſm, the Sacrament of our initiation into the Church, and have aſcribed*

our

our admiſſion or entrance into it, thereunto pag. 46. To which I anſwer.

Bap. It ſeems then, that Mr. *Wills* is wiſer then his orthodox Divines.

2. If Baptiſm be a ſign of our being already in Chriſt, and ſo members of the Church before they are Baptized; Then I hope our children may be in Chriſt, & reputed members of the Church, though they are not Baptized. And then what need is there of theſe clamours againſt the Baptiſts for keeping their children out of the Church, and (in as much as in them lyes) hindring their ſalvation, when they are in Chriſt, and members of his Church before Baptiſm, by vertue of their parents faith? And if you ſay, *we deny them a priviledge that is due to them*; We ſay, we do not: Our great deſire is they ſhould be Baptized, and do inſtruct them in the principles of Chriſtianity for that end; that as ſoon as they are capable to improve the priviledge they may have it. And as for the Circumſtance of time your ſelves ſay, that is not materal, whether it be done on the 8th. 10th. or 20th. day, and why may not the Baptiſts deferr it to the 20th. year, there being as much warrant in Scriptures for the one as for the other, though indeed no poſitive rule for either, only the time of believing is the moſt certain time aſſigned for Baptiſm.

3. But thirdly Mr *Wills* ſpoiles all he has ſaid, and contradicts himſelf *pag.* 229. where he ſaith, *that as Circumciſion gave entrance into the Church of the Jews, ſo are believers and their ſeed by Baptiſm entred into the Goſpel Church.* And it will not

help him to say, *that Infants by vertue of their parents faith are only members of the universal visible Church* (as he calls it) *before Baptism, but not of any particular Church*: For he himself saith, *that he that is a member of the universal Church, may at any time claim his priviledge in any particular Church.*

What confusion is here! sometimes Baptism gives not admittance into the Church, but they are members of the Church before as pag. 27, 28. And then again that believers and their seed are by Baptism admitted into particular Churches; at another place that Baptism only admits them into the Universal visible Church. I think *Mr Wills* has little hopes to reconcile the *Baptists* and the *Pœdo-Baptists*, seeing he is not reconciled to himself.

But as to the principle you mention *that persons may be Church members before they are Baptized*: Its true Mr *Wills* makes a great stir against Mr *Paul* and others, whom he calls rigid Anabaptists because they cannot see any ground to admit persons to the supper before Baptism. And therefore labours hard to prove that which he confesses Orthodox divines are against, yet he would be singular, and force this novelty upon the world, which himself & but few others have of late contended for. But what would the man have? suppose a Turk or a Jew should be converted, would he admit them to the supper before Baptism? and so own them Church members, whether ever they were baptised or not? God strictly commanded of old, that no uncircumcised person should eate

the

the paſſeover: And what rule have you that unbaptized perſons ſhould be admitted to the ſupper? But he tells us this is the opinion only of ſome rigid *Anabaptiſt*, and thinks there to ſhelter himſelf. Indeed Mr *Ieſſey*, and ſome other good men were of that opinion, that ſome perſons might be admitted to the ſupper who were not yet convinced, but that their Infant-Baptiſm was true Baptiſm. But why muſt all others be counted rigid Anabaptiſts becauſe they cannot ſee with other mens eyes? But this is one of the many ſcurrilous reflections in Mr *Wills*'s Book, to ſupply the ſcarcity of Argument. I could tell him of ſome rigid *Independents*, and rigid *Presbyterians* too, who are ſo far from having Communion with the Baptiſts, that they would pluck up ſuch Tares (ſo they account them) out of the field of the world, and that before the harveſt, contrary to the expreſſe words of our Saviour. *Let both grow together till the harveſt*: And the reaſon is very cogent; *leſt plucking up the tares, you pluck up the wheat alſo.* But Mr *Wills* makes amends for this and tells us, that ſome of the Baptiſts are godly, *liberal* men, of holy and pious converſations and ſuch whom he could have communion with; but this is *Joabs* curteſy, *who ſalutes* Abner *friendly, but ſmote him under the fifth ribb.* And I may ſay *Meliora ſunt amici vulnera, quàm inimici oſcula.* The many hard ſpeeches, and uncomely reflections, the ſo often mentioning the miſcariages of the people in *Germany* he calls by that denominat on ſhew what gall his pen was dipt in. But for all theſe things I ſay, *The Lord forgive him.*

Pœdo.

Pædo. Sir I thank you for this discourse and the pains you have taken in order to my satisfaction. I confesse I finde my self more convinc'd then I was; and do think you are of the surest side, it being most certain that believers were and ought to be baptized; but whether any Infants were or ought, is very uncertain. And surely it is safest (in controverted matters) to adhere to that side that is most certain. Besides there are two things that I am much stumbled at.

The First, is the great ignorance of the members of the Pædo-baptist congregations in this matter: Not one amongst many, is able to prove Infant-Baptism, or to answer your Arguments, but are forced to referr the matter to their ministers: whereas, hardly any amongst you, but are able to give a satisfactory reason of their hope in this thing; and can presently prove believers Baptism from Scripture precept and example. As of old if a heathen had demanded of any Jew the reason and Ground of his circumcision, he could presently turn to the *17th. of Genesis*, and there prove it from a positive command of God. But if a heathen should ask us, why we baptize our Infants, we that are but ordinary persons know not how to satisfy him; we cannot direct him to any Scripture where it is written: Which is strange, that a Gospel ordinance should be left so dark and intricate, and the ordinance of circumcision under the law, be so plain and obvious that every child of any reason could presently shew the ground of it. This makes me suspect the truth of it; because the Apostle says he used great

plainess

plaineſſe of ſpeech, and not as *Moſes* who put a vail upon his face, *&c.* ſurely Goſpel Ordinances ſhould be ſo plain, eſpecially as to the ſubjects, that he that runs may read them.

2*ly.* The next thing that offends me is the great difference amongſt Miniſters, about the ground of Infant-Baptiſm, as if they knew not where to faſten it, what baſis to build it upon, ſome (as Mr *Danvers* obſerves) draw it from the Univerſality of grace, and the neceſſity of Baptiſm to ſalvation, as *Cyprian* and others.

Some from the faith of the Church; ſome from a ſuppoſed ſeminal faith that may be in the child.

Some from the faith of the parents; others from the faith of the ſureties; ſome (if the immediate parents be not Godly) think the faith of the Grand-father, or great-Grand-father may ſerve.

Some upon the account of Covenant holyneſſe, or the promiſe made to *Abraham* and his ſeed; others, if both, or one of the parents be a member of a gathered Church. Some think they are born members of the viſible Church by vertue of their parents faith, and ſo may be baptized.

Beſides this there is a great difference about baptizing of baſtards: ſome think if the father repent, the child may be baptized; others think otherwiſe, becauſe a Baſtard was not to enter into the Congregation to the 10th. generation; and ſo about the children of excommunicate perſons, *&c.* All which makes us fear that we are out of the way, and our leaders have cauſed us to err ſeeing they cannot agree, upon what ground

to

to baptiſe our Infants. Its true Mr *Wills* pretends to anſwer this, but very weakly: he tells us the baptiſts differ amongſt themſelves about the ground of their practiſe; but ſure I am there is no ſuch material difference as there's amongſt us.

You are all agreed that the profeſſion of faith and Repentance is the ground of Baptiſm, and if ſome deſire a larger confeſſion then others, and ſignes of grace, I think it is no great error, but rather an evidence of zeal to God, and good to the parties ſoul. But what is this to thoſe material and eſſential differences before mentioned?

Theſe things will put me upon further ſearch, and I hope what you have ſaid will be of advantage to me. In the mean time I take leave and bid you farewell.

Errata.

P. 64. l. 16. r. marrs *all*, p. 95. l. 1. r. *betterneſſe*. In the letter to Mr *Will's* 5. l. 3. r. *Magiſterially*. p. 9. l. 11. for heat r. *heart*. Mis-ſpellings and mis-pointings correct as you meet them.

FINIS.

Concerning Unity.

OUr Opponents cry out for Unity, and would fain lay the cauſe of that hateful Word [*Diviſion*] at our doors, and methinks they might well forbear making ſuch a noiſe, unleſs they aſſign us what kind of the ſeveral ſorts of Unity they mean, and propound ſome *Mediums* to make the ſame practicable. And I may ſay, What Unity? ſo long as that imperious, reflecting, and condemning Spirit remains in them. Some forbidding of their Members to hear our Miniſters, or to read their Books; rather allowing them liberty to joyn with the Multitude, than to appear in our Societies. But if I may ſpell out their meaning, it ſeems to be this.

That all the *Anti-pædo-Baptiſts* ſhould break up their Societies, and joyn with them, and own their Miniſters for their Paſtors, ſuffer them quietly to Baptize Infants, *&c.* and ſo ſin againſt their Conſciences; it appearing to them to be groſs Superſtition, and the Prophanation of an Ordinance. But ſhould they tell you, they judge there is as good, if not better grounds that you ſhould joyn with them, and own the Baptiſm of Believers (the only Scripture Baptiſm) I know not where a Moderator or Umpire would be found to determine this matter. And how can Two walk together, except they be agreed?

So that the Unity of the Verity is not ſurely the thing they hope for; for though it be greatly deſirable, yet very hard to obtain, becauſe one man thinks this to be truth, and another that, according to the ſeveral Lights they have received. And if it be the Unity of Authority they intend, that the Magiſtrate ſhould ſet down ſome Uniform practice, and command all manner of perſons to comply thereunto; this looks like divers of them. But were there ſuch a practice attempted and yielded unto, it might make many Hypocrites in the higheſt degree of Hypocriſie; but be far from that ſpiritual Unity they talk of.

Nor can an Unity of perſwaſion be hoped for, ſeeing both in Preſs and Pulpit, and other wayes, both Parties have endeavoured to perſwade one another, but to little or no Effect.

Nor can it be an Unity of Neceſſity, now in Times of common danger; for Tyes of neceſſity uſually bind no longer than one Side hath need of another.

Nor can any Unity of Covenant do it, for that is forced in many places; and *I* fear too many ſay, as the Heathen did, *Juravi Lingua, mentem injuratam gero*, *I* ſwore with my tongue, but not with my heart.

Seeing then we cannot find out what kind of Unity is intended, it is beſt for both parties to continue in the Societies to whom they belong, till God ſhall convince them otherwiſe; provided they do not put out their light, and ſin againſt their Conſciences, nor neglect any opportunity, better to inform their Judgments.

But there is one kind of Unity yet behind, and that

is

is the unity of Affections; and if you mean this; I am willing to joyn iſſue with you, and in this I cannot but blame the whole generation of Profeſſors, who are greatly faulty in this matter.

For my own part, I know the ſhadows of the everlaſting Evening are upon me, and am every day walking upon the Banks of Eternity, and do hope er'e long to enter into thoſe ſacred Manſions, where all the Saints are of one mind, where we ſhall poſſeſs, not diſpute our Unity; wherefore I ſhall leave my Teſtimony for the unity of Charity and Affection amongſt all that are Godly, though of different perſwaſions; and ſhall enforce it from theſe Conſiderations.

1. *From the work of Regeneration*, which ſome of all differing Profeſſors can experience. Indeed while in a ſtate of unregeneration, nothing is to be expected but Jars and Contentions, for all Diviſion comes from ſin, *Scelera diſſident*. It is ſo in the natural body, one affection ſtruggles in the Soul for maſtery; Ambition fights with malice, and Pride with Covetouſneſs: the head plots againſt the heart, and the heart ſwells againſt the head. Reaſon and Appetite, Will and Paſſion, Soul and Body ſet the whole frame of Nature into a continual Combuſtion, one Faculty moves contrary to the Government or Attraction of another, and ſo as in a confluence of contrary Streams and Winds, the World is turned into a maze of Contentions.

But when once we become Chriſtians, and are made conformable to Chriſt, it preſently maketh of two one; and ſo worketh peace: It ſlayeth the hatred and war in the Members of Chriſt againſt one another; it reduceth to that primitive harmony, and

uniform Spirituality. Yea Converſion layes an obligation upon Chriſtians to love one another: If we love him that Begat, we cannot but love him that is Begotten.

2. *Becauſe all things elſe agree*: The beams of the Sun, though divided and diſtinct from one another, have yet an unity in the ſame nature of light, becauſe all partake of one Native and Original ſplendor. The limbs of a Tree, though all ſeveral, and ſpreading divers wayes, yet have an unity in the ſame Fruit; becauſe all are incorporated into one Stock and Root. The ſtreams of a River, though running divers wayes, do yet all agree in the unity of ſweetneſs and clearneſs, becauſe all iſſuing from the ſame pure Fountain. Why then ſhould not Chriſtians, though of different Perſwaſions, agree in the unity of Love and Affection?

3. *Becauſe by Diviſion, Diſcord, and Rebellion the Apoſtate Angels loſt their Heavenly Habitation, and are for ever plunged into eaſeleſs and remedileſs Torments.* The Devil was Created an Angel of Light, and ſtood a while in Unity and Harmony until he began to Jar, and enter into Diviſion, and to chuſe to be an abſolute Nature of himſelf; and would ſeparate and break himſelf off from Unity, by which he became viler than the vileſt of Gods Creatures: And ſo it is poſſible, for perſons by leaving the principles of Harmony, Unity, and Love, to fall from the moſt glorious ſtate of profeſſion, into endleſs miſery and perdition.

The excellency of the unity of Charity appears further from thoſe *Notæ quietis*, or letters of reſt naturally imprinted upon the whole Series of Created Beings; for if we ſurvey the particulars of this ſtately Fabrick,

Fabrick, we ſhall find the image of peace and love impreſſed and imprinted, as the Conſervatory principle of their Natures, ſtampt at firſt by the Divine Creator, when out (of a confuſed Chaos) it pleaſed the Eternal parent, or Radical principle of all things (being not willing that ſo large a ſpace ſhould be Eternally bereft of his gracious influence, or his bounty any longer fruſtrated, from Communicating Happineſs to ſo many millions of Creatures as might act upon this Stage) to effect this Creation; for when by his powerful Word he applyed himſelf to Create this ſenſible World, out of ſo great diſorder and confuſion; he effects it with ſo much ſymmetry and proportion, that Nature ſeems to loſe it ſelf in the Harmony of ſuch a Being. And as the Crown and perfection of all doth ſo imprint peace and unity in it, that to attempt the Extirpation of theſe from the Univerſe, were to endeavour the reduction of this ſtately Engine into its Original Chaos and Confuſion.

Beſides we find when the great Creator began to make a diviſion in this ſenſible World, it was only of ſuch things as were directly contrary and oppoſite to one another, as light and darkneſs, *Gen.* 1. 4. *And God divided the light from the darkneſs, and God ſaw that it was good*; ſhewing us that it was never intended there ſhould be any diviſion in the World, but between light and darkneſs; things directly and eſſentially contrary.

Therefore in the next Diviſion (which was the Work of the Second day) that was between the Waters and the Waters, things of the ſame kind and nature, and that work had no Bleſſing annexed to it, becauſe it was the firſt breach of Unity; which num-

ber ſome ſay is branded with infamy, *Numerus Binarius infamoſus eſt, quia primus auſus eſt diſcedere ab unitate*, becauſe it was the firſt that durſt depart from unity. And though there be a kind of war between the Elements, yet ſome are of Opinion, that it is more imaginary than real; for we find ſometimes they will forget their Natural ſtations and properties, and (to avoid *vacuum*) will mutually paſs into the room of one another; yea, not only lovingly to mix, but to dwell with one another peaceably; as fire and water will ſometime dwell together; as we ſee in Tempeſts of Thunder, Rain, and Hail; and alſo in Spirit of Wine, and other things.

But eſpecially things of the ſame Tribe and Kind do moſt earneſtly affect one another (from an Innate principle of Union) as Water and Salt do mutually embrace each other.

And as the harmonious aſſent of things amongſt themſelves is admirable, ſo the Heavens with the Lower Region is no leſs wonderful; for in the whole frame of Nature, there is ſuch an admirable mixture, that all the deſign is to maintain a Friendly Union and concatenation between themſelves; deſiring only to gratifie the Supream Ruler, and benefit each other: Nature ordering and diſpoſing all things to be carryed about in a moſt uniform Circulation.

And now is it not ſtrange, when the whole Creation, doth, as it were, ſtudy peace and amity, man ſhould continue and practice the contrary? And thoſe that ſhould be lead by the Spirit into Unity and Love, ſhould be ſent to the meaneſt Creatures to learn their Leſſons of peace and concord?

Laſtly, We may conſider the Evils that Diſcord brings upon the Outward man; it was diſcord, diviſion, and

and contention that brought, and ſtill brings thoſe Bodily maladies, ſickneſſes, aches, paines, and weakneſs upon the Bodies of Men; and at laſt death it ſelf. For how came thoſe things intothe World, but from the rebellious ſtrivings and contentions of the Body with the Soul: For as long as *Adams* mind was ſubject unto God, and ſtood in Harmony and Union with him, the inferior powers of the Soul were obedient unto Reaſon, and the Body unto the Soul, and this Union prevents all infirmities and ſickneſſes; but he no ſooner Rebels againſt God, and breaks himſelf off from this Union, and enters into Diviſion, but he preſently finds Contention raging within him; for now thoſe inferior powers, will be no longer ſubject unto Reaſon; but the rebellious pride of the Carnal appetite is ſuch, that the Body ceaſeth to be any longer ſubject to the Soul; upon which ſtrivings and contentions enter, and from thence all manner of Diſeaſes and Diſtempers upon the Body: for death, and all corporeal infirmities are but the immediate effects of the diſobedience of the Body to the Soul; and man is entred into Contrariety, not only with himſelf, but others alſo, and hath a property and principle of Contradiction, whereby he oppoſes, quarrels, divides from, and contends with others. And is ſo far departed from the unity and harmonious agreement that ſhould be in the minds of men, eſpecially Chriſtians, that now there ariſeth paſſion, anger, and envy; which ſo diſturbs, torments, and diſquiets the mind (becauſe others are not like us) that from thence follow in a great meaſure, diſeaſes, infirmities, and bodily diſtempers; becauſe the Soul departs from Harmony, and is in continual vexation and anxiety; ſo that the Humors of the Body are diſquieted, and

the radical moisture destroyed. Persons that are of a Cholerick Temper, are more subject to Diseases, than those of a more quiet and serene disposition; their passion inflames the inward parts, and disorders the whole frame of Nature, and envious men are subject to Consumptive distempers.

Invidus alterius rebus macrescit Opimis) because his mind is full of dissatisfaction and disquietness, being departed from Unity. And *Solomon* tells us, *The bloody-minded man shall not live out half his dayes*: And we know those *Anchorets* and *Monks* that have retired from the World into Dens and Caves of the Earth, that they might live a contemplative Life, and be free from all manner of discord, contention, and division, have lived to an exceeding Old Age, and free from those distempers, and Bodily Infirmities that others meet with; the unity, agreement, and harmony of their minds much conducing to their bodily health. So it's said of *Moses*, *that he was an hundred and twenty years old when he dyed; his Eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated*, Deut. 34. 7. we know of what quiet, serene, and meek Spirit he was of, *Numb.* 12. 3. *Now the man* Moses *was very meek above all the men which were upon the face of the Earth*; so that the quietness of his mind did very much contribute to the sanity of his Body. And if Men and Women would more follow the Counsel of the Physitian of their Souls, who bids us live in peace, unity, and love; they would not (perhaps) so often want a Physitian for their Bodies.

FINIS.

Some Short Queſtions and Anſwers for the Younger Sort.

Queſt. *WEre not the Children of Believers Church-Members before* Abraham's *time?*

Anſw. No, the Scripture makes no mention of any ſuch thing; neither was there any viſible ſign or mark appointed by God to diſtinguiſh them from the Children of Unbelievers.

Queſt. Was there no ſucceſſive conveyance of Grace from believing Parents to their Children?

Anſw. No, becauſe the Children of Believers prov'd as wicked as others; inſomuch as all fleſh had corrupted its wayes, and God brought the flood upon the World of Ungodly.

Queſt. *What then became of the Children that Dyed from* Adam *to* Abraham?

Anſw. Thoſe that belonged to the Election of Grace were Saved, though in no outward Covenant, nor ſigned by any Viſible Ordinance.

Queſt. *Why then did God make a Covenant with* Abraham *and his Seed, and diſtinguiſh them from all Nations?*

Anſw. Becauſe he had a deſign that the *Meſſiah* ſhould come of his Loins, and therefore his Males only are commanded to be Circumciſed, to ſignifie that Chriſt ſhould be a Man-child, and ſhould ſhed his Blood for the ſins of Believers.

Queſt.

Quest. *What other Ends were there of Circumcision?*

Answ. To distinguish them from other Nations, with whom they were not to Marry, lest the Succession should be Interrupted, and so the *Messiah* not come of *Abrahams* Loynes.

Quest. *What advantage had they of Circumcision besides?*

Answ. They were counted the Visible people of God for a time, had the Laws of God committed to them, and the Land of *Canaan*, and divers Earthly Blessings bestowed upon them.

Quest. *But had any other People any right to Eternal Life and Salvation?*

Answ. Yea; It being evident that God had divers of his people amongst the Gentiles who belonged to the Election of Grace, as *Job*, and his Three Friends, and others, which appears by *Bildad's* appeal to the Ancients, *Job* 8. 8, 10. *For enquire I pray thee of the Former Age, and prepare thy self to the search of their Fathers*; and *vers.* 10. *shall not they teach thee, &c.*

Quest. *But how came it to pass that the Jews became the People of God, and not others?*

Answ. By vertue of a Grant from God to *Abraham*, who freely made a promise to be a God to him, and his Seed after him.

Quest. *Was this promise made to* Abraham *because he was better than others, or before, or after he Believed?*

Answ. No, It was freely of Grace, for God found him an Idolater, and these Promises were made to him before he Believed; for we hear nothing of his Faith till *Gen.* 15. 6.

Quest.

Quest. *Were his Children then Partakers of those Priviledges, meerly by being descended from his Loynes?*

Answ. Yea; we find no other Reason rendred.

Quest. *But we hear* Abraham *was a Believer, and received the sign of Circumcision as a token of the righteousness he had by Faith: Is it necessary then that his Children have the like Faith?*

Answ. 'Tis true, *Abraham* Believed after the Promise, and was Circumcised; but it was not Commanded that his Children should Believe in order to Circumcision.

Quest. *But as* Abraham *was a Believer before his Children had a right to Circumcision, so should it not be known that every Father in* Israel *were a Believer, before his Child were admitted to Circumcision?*

Answ. No: for all were required to Circumcise their Children, whether the Parent Believed, or not.

Quest. *Were none to be Circumcised but those that Descended from* Abraham?

Answ. Yea, all that were born in his House, or bought with money.

Quest. *But was it not required that those Servants in* Abraham's *House should profess Faith before they and their Children were Circumcised?*

Answ. No, It was not commanded to be done upon any condition of Faith, in the Parent or Child that was a Servant.

Quest. *Were* Abrahams *Children Circumcised by vertue of any right they had to the Covenant of Grace above others?*

Answ. No; for some of *Noah's* Children, &c. had a Right to the Covenant of Grace, yet not Circumcised

ciſed; and *Eſau* and *Iſhmael &c.* had no right to the Covenant of Grace, and yet Circumciſed,

Queſt. *Were not Infants Church-Members in* Abraham's *time?*

Anſw. Yea; the Church and the Common-wealth being all one, they muſt needs be Members.

Queſt. *When did their Memberſhip ceaſe?*

Anſw. When Chriſt came and had ſuffered; when the Prieſthood was changed, when the Law of Circumciſion ceaſed, when the natural branches were broken off, the old Houſe removed, and a new one built.

Queſt. *Are not the Infants of the* Gentiles *Church-members now in the dayes of the Goſpel?*

Anſw. No, there being no Inſtitution or Command for it; beſides the Church and the Common-wealth are now divided, and God hath not taken in any one Nation, or ſort of people diſtinct from others to be his Church; but Believers only out of every Kindred, Tongue, and Nation.

Queſt. *Have not then the Infants of Believing* Gentiles *leſs priviledg than the* Jews *had?*

Anſw No; For Circumciſion had been no priviledg nor duty, had there been no Inſtitution for it: Neither is Baptiſm a priviledge or duty to any, but to thoſe to whom it is Commanded. But the priviledges of the Children of Believing *Gentiles* are greater than the *Jews*; becauſe the *Meſſiah* being come, which is the ſum and ſubſtance of all their ſhadows, of Circumciſion, of Memberſhip, and all their Typical Ordinances: So that as ſoon as Infants are capable of Underſtanding, they are to be brought up in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord, *i. e.* the Lord *Jeſus*, the Anti-Type of all their Types; who is

to

to be made known unto them, as being already come, and hath ſuffered for all that Believe in him. Whereas the *Jews* could but inform their Children, that Chriſt would come, and ſuffer for the ſins of men.

Queſt. *Have not thoſe that had a right to the priviledges of the Old Covenant, a right to the priviledges of the new, by vertue of their former right?*

Anſw. No; for then the *Jews* had a right to Baptiſm without any profeſſion of Faith and Repentance. Beſides the Apoſtle ſaith, *Heb*, 13.10. *We have an Altar whereof they have no right to eat that ſerve the Tabernacle*: And ſo we ſay, we have a Baptiſm, that Infants have no right to, as they had to Circumciſion; becauſe there is no Inſtitution for it.

Queſt. *But may not the Children of the* Gentiles *be counted* Abraham's *Seed?*

Anſw. No; For *Abraham* hath but two Seeds, the natural *Jew*, and profeſſed Believers amongſt *Jews* and *Gentiles*: a third Seed cannot be aſſigned him.

Queſt. *But may not Infants be counted Chriſts Seed?*

Anſw. No; for Chriſt left no natural Iſſue, (who ſhall declare his Generation) ſhewing us that he did not intend to build his Church of Natural Children (as of Old) not of dead, but of living Stones. Beſides Believers Children are Children of Wrath by nature as well as others, and therefore not to be accounted Chriſts Seed, or to be Baptized, while ſo conſidered.

Queſt. *Is not Baptiſm an Ordinance of the New Teſtament, and muſt it not be proved by a New-Teſtament Inſtitution?*

Anſw. Yea.

Queſt.

Quest. *Where is your Institution then for Infant Baptism?*

Answ. It is urged to be *Gen.* 17.7. I will be a God to thee and to thy Seed.

Quest. *Is there any thing concerning Baptism in this Scripture?*

Answ. No, But we draw this Consequence, that as God promised to be God to *Abraham* and his Seed; so he will be a God to every Believer and his Seed.

Quest. *Did God in these words promise to save* Abraham *and all his Natural Seed?*

Answ. No, But the meaning is, that he and his Seed should be the Visible Church, and enjoy the Ordinances, which no other people should.

Quest. *And does this promise belong to believing* Gentiles, *and their natural Seed, that they only shall be the visible Church of God, and their Children only enjoy the Ordinances of God successively from their Parents?*

Answ. No; for then these Absurdities would follow.

1. That God has not been as good as his promise, for the Church has not been continued in the posterity of Believers since Christs time, but often passed out of their Race into the Posterity of Unbelievers.

2. That then, since the first promulgation of the Gospel, there is no such need of Preaching to the Heathen, in as much as these being not of the Posterity of Believers, they are not to be of the Visible Church, nor enjoy the Ordinances: So that it is a fallacy to hold that God hath promised to be a God to Believers and their Natural Seed, as he did to *Abra-*

ham

ham and his Seed; to continue his Church only in the Posterity of them that first received the Gospel. But he is still gathering his Church out of the posterity of Unbelievers, and therefore before the end of the World the Angel is said to Preach the Everlasting Gospel to every Nation, Kindred, and Tongue, and People, who are not of the posterity of Believers.

Quest. *Why do the Pædo-baptists Baptize their Infants?*

Answ. Because (they say) they are in the Covenant of Grace.

Quest. *How do they know that?*

Answ. Because both, or one of the Parents, are in the Covenant of Grace.

Quest. *How does that appear?*

Answ. Because they profess so to be. Then if the Parent be an Hypocrite, the Child is not rightly Baptized.

Quest. *From what Ground do the* Baptists *Baptize Persons?*

Answ. Because they make a Profession of Faith and Repentance; which is warrant enough from the Scripture.

Quest. *But how if they be Hypocrites, are they rightly* Baptized?

Answ. Yea; because it is not necessary for them to know that the Person is in the Covenant of Grace; but that he professes himself a Disciple of Christ; for which they have Scripture-president, and many Examples.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

SOon after I had finiſhed this Treatiſe, Mr. *Baxter's* Book came to my Hands: And in regard of his long ſilence, ſome great matter was expected: but after my peruſal of it, I find no News at all. The firſt part of his Book (even 180 pages) is nothing elſe but a Collection of certain Old Letters that paſt between him and Mr. *Tombs* long ſince: In which, whether he hath dealt Candidly with Mr. *Tombs* I know not, the contrary is juſtly feared; if the Reader take notice of thoſe Pieces, Scrips, and Parcels of Letters from Mr. *Tombes*, but his own Written at large.

As to the matter contained in thoſe Letters, I find it to be nothing but what hath been Anſwered long ſince; and it would amount to no other than Superfluity, and Tautology to Anſwer over again. The trueſt Verdict I can give of it, is, *that it is* (like moſt of his other Controverſies) *a lump of Logical Superfluity, a Syſtem of Syllogiſtical Vanity, wherein the Man manages his War like ſome Freſh man that is newly Matriculated into the Faculty of Logicking in Mood and Figure, that delights to hear himſelf Syllogize out every Syllable; and ſo comes out with a huge heap of Hypotheticals, arguing at a vaſt difference from the buſineſs of* Baptiſm, *and ſometimetimes* Ex Suppoſitis non Supponendis *too, as if he ſhould fetch Infant baptiſm from far, ſince 'tis ſo dark in Scripture* (as he has confeſſed it is) *that he cannot have it nigh at hand; proving in a great*

great Circumference of Conſequence upon Conſequence, Syllogiſm upon Syllogiſm; thus, if this, then that; if this, then that; but this, therefore that; when very often neither this, nor that, is true: So that like a Tree, his Book runs out into ſo many ſmaller Boughs, and Twigs, and layes it ſelf out at large into ſuch a train of Trivials, ſo many littles to the purpoſe; that he will find himſelf great ſtore of ſmall buſineſs that ſhall throw away ſo much of his precious time to read his Book.

The next thing I take notice of in his Book is his Anſwer to Mr. *Danvers* his Collections, *&c.* wherein the Reader will find ſo much Gall and Vinegar, ſuch a proud, auſtere, magiſterial Spirit, ſuch ſcurrilous, unchriſtian Language, that it makes me amaſed, and to queſtion, whether this be Mr. *Baxter* or his Coadjutor Mr. *Wills*. But it ſeems they are both agreed in their unſavory Dialect. Is this the man that Wrote ſo much for Love and Unity? and would make the World believe that he is made up of nothing but Charity? Suppoſe Mr. *Danvers* ſhould be miſtaken in ſome of his Collections; had it not been better to have ſhewed him his miſtakes in a Mild, Chriſtian, and Brotherly way? And if you ſay *the offence was publique, and therefore deſerved a publique reproof.* Grant that alſo, yet what need theſe peeviſh, bitter, and angry reflections? Hath Mr. *Baxter* forgot that Scripture, *Gal.* 6. 1. *If any man be overtaken in a fault, ye that are ſpiritual, reſtore ſuch a one in the Spirit of meekneſs*: He contemptuouſly calls him (Maj. *Danvers* a *Souldier*) but why a Souldier? I confeſs an Officer ought to be a Soldier, but he was a Collonel as well as Mr. B. was a Chaplain, and Mr. B. knows 'tis not civil, nor do Souldiers love to be retrograded, no more than Chaplains. Would he think it kindly done, if he

were dwindled from a Chaplain in Folio to a puny Curate in duodecimo, I doubt his ambitious Humor would rather be Pope, but I ſuppoſe he means, that he was ſo once, and perhaps it was when M. *Baxter* was Chaplain; and ſurely it is the Chaplain's work with all mildneſs and gentleneſs to convince his Officers of any error. But it's like in thoſe dayes he uſed better Language, and accomodated himſelf to the humors of his Officers, or elſe *Fama mendax*. But perhaps hee'll tell us, he looks upon Mr. *Danvers* as a rigid Anabaptiſt; whom (with the Independents) he condemns and cenſures as ignorant ſilly perſons, *&c.* in his uſual Civility, not deſerving the leaſt grain of his Charity.

But what does the man mean? do they ſeparate from the Church of *Rome*? ſo do's Mr. *Baxter*. Do they ſeparate from the Church of *England*? ſo did Mr. *Baxter* (as conſtituted by Epiſcopacy) but what he does now is a hard queſtion. But I ſhall leave Mr. *Danvers* to vindicate himſelf.

Another thing notable, is his 56 *Articles* of Faith, that he ſuppoſes the Anabaptiſts and others muſt hold, if they deny his Popiſh Poſitions in his *Chriſtian Directory*, *&c.* It were no hard matter to Father many groſſer abſurdities upon Mr. *Baxter*, were his raw and undigeſted Notions, and erroneous principles noted, that have paſt his Pen (at ſeveral times) for above theſe Twenty years. But leaving his other miſtakes, it will be no Injury to tell you, that one Article of Mr. *Baxter*'s Faith is; *That all the Children, all the numerous poſterity of Unbelievers, yea of ſuch Unbelievers whoſe immediate Parents or Parent, were not Enchurcht, are all in the Kingdom of the Devil, and neceſſarily damned:* Seeing he holds that *the Children*

of

of Believers only are the Subjects of Baptiſm, being born within the Covenant of Grace, Children of God, Heirs of Chriſt, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. But if Mr. *Baxter* in theſe Fifty ſix Articles (nay in moſt of his late Writings) hath not more gratified the Papiſts, and contributed to their Cauſe, more than any *Engliſh* Proteſtant Divine ever did, yea at once, (as much as in him lyes) thrown away the Proteſtant Cauſe, and as far as his Credit goes, ſpoiled all, that our Famous Champions have done, I am much miſtaken; having hereby lai'd ſuch ſtumbling blocks in the way of ordinary Chriſtians, far beyond the moſt crafty Jeſuite that ever hath been amongſt us.

He tells us he will Write no more, but he hath a mighty Faith that will believe him. I am of Mr. *Bagſhaw's* mind, who told him ſome time ſince, when Mr. *Baxter* told him he would not anſwer him; Mr. Bagſhaw replyes, *I know you will not keep your word, for your pride will put you upon Writing, and your guilt will neceſſitate you to do it*; juſt in as unbecoming a manner as you have done: *for an ill Cauſe muſt be maintained by Calumny.*

And then in a luſory way tells us, *That if theſe Children will after this baul, and cry, and wrangle, and foul the Houſe* (a ſavory Metaphor!) *he is not bound to rock the Cradle, and to make them clean.*

From whence may it not follow (1.) That Mr. *Baxter* owns the Anabaptiſts as his Children; but whether inſtead of an indulgent Nurſe he has not proved a cruel Step-mother, let the World judge.

2. That the *Anabaptiſts* are foul, (ſweetly ſpoken!) and all the paines he hath taken in his Writings theſe Twenty years has been to clean them. But whether he hath not caſt more dirt and filth upon them; and

made them fouler than ever he found them, is eaſie to be determined by any that reads his plain Scripture-proof, *&c.*

The next thing I obſerve is, How ſtrenuonſly he ſtrives to have the Fathers on his ſide; and fearing he ſhould loſe the Argument from Antiquity, we ſee how the ſleepy Lyon's rouſed, and roars like a Son of Thunder, fearing the Old worn-out cauſe of *Infant-Baptiſm* ſhould be routed, and never rally again; But he muſt know we are not ſo fond of the Fathers from the Third Century, that being as *Tully* ſayes, *Omiſſis fontibus conſectari rivulos*, we believe Infant-Baptiſm is ancient, and ſo are other Errors more antient; but from the beginning it was not ſo.

But that which confirms me againſt this Fallacy of Infant-Baptiſm, is, that the firſt that mention it, do alſo mention the Erroneous Grounds upon which it was practiſed, *viz. for the waſhing away Original Sin.; for the conferring of Grace, and abſolute neceſſity thereof to Salvation, &c.* But let Mr. *Baxter* ſhew us if he can, that any of the Fathers ſpeaks of Infant-Baptiſm as to be performed upon the grounds he and others in this Land have practiced it, *i. e.* the Childs being in the Covenant of Grace by vertue of both or one of the Parents perſonally manifeſting his Faith and Repentance, and being an Enchurched Member of ſome Congregation, *&c.* Here I dare ſay, Mr. *Baxter* has none of the Fathers of his ſide, now his Orthodox Fathers are Heterodox; but is it not ſtrange, that if Infant-Baptiſm were an Apoſtolical Tradition as divers affirmed, and ſome ſtill dream, that the Apoſtles had not delivered the true grounds upon which it ſhould be practiced as well as the practice

ctice it ſelf. Or did theſe Holy Fathers only keep the ſubject, and ſo ſoon loſe the grounds. So that I muſt give this ſhort but true Character of Mr. *Baxter* and his late Book that he hath written, neither with that gravity that became his Age, with that Sobriety that became his profeſſion, nor with that modeſty that became any tolerable Education. And ſince he ſo much forgets himſelf, I muſt tell him that that Gentleman Mr. *Danvers*, whom he ſo inſolently deſpiſes, is (to ſay no more) his Superior, a perſon of known worth, piety, and integrity, and one whom God hath choſen to bear witneſs to his truth, at that very time when he a Learned Scribe is ſhaken with every wind, and ſcruples not to change his Judgement for and againſt things, as the ſtream of outward ſucceſs doth guide and influence them. I ſhall now conclude with Mr. *Baxter's* Opinion of the Anabaptiſts, when his heat is over; he ſaith thus [in his laſt Book,] *There two ſorts of Anabaptiſts amongſt us, the one are ſober Godly Chriſtians, who when they are Re-baptized, to ſatisfie their Conſciences, live amongſt us in Chriſtian love and peace. And I ſhall be aſhamed, if I love not them as heartily, and own them not as peacably as any of them ſhall do either me, or better men than I, that differ from them.*

The other ſort hold it unlawful to hold Communion with ſuch as are not of their mind and way, and are Schiſmatically Troubleſome and Unquiet, in labouring to encreaſe their party.

I hope all the pious Anabaptiſts *do virtually, though not actually devote their Children to God, and Conſent to their Covenant-relation, while they vehemently plead againſt it; for ſurely they have ſo much natural Affection, that if they did think that God would be a God, in a*

ſpecial Covenant with their Children, and pardon their Original Sin, and give them right to future Life, upon the Parents dedication and conſent, they would undoubtedly accept the gift and be thankful: And I believe moſt of them would ſay, I would do all that God entruſteth me to do, that my Child may be a Child of God, and accept any Mercy from him, as far as God doth authorize me ſo to do, page 188, 199.

Indeed my Judgement was and is, that the point of Infant-Baptiſm hath its conſiderable difficulties, which may occaſion Wiſe and Good men to doubt, or to be miſtaken in it, page 219.

Therefore I never took the point of it to have ſuch weight, as that all that differed from me in it, muſt be denyed either love, liberty, or communion. If I know my own heart, I do as heartily love a ſober Godly man that is againſt Infant-Baptiſm, as I do ſuch men that differ from me in other Controverſies: and much better than one of my own Judgement who hath leſs Piety and Sobriety.

Nor do I think there is ſo much Maliguity in the bare Opinion which denyeth Infant Baptiſm, as that all the Anabaptiſts *miſcarriages ſhould ariſe from the nature of that Opinion.* Ibid.

I know that in the Ancient Churches men were left at Liberty, both when they would be Baptized themſelves, and when their Children ſhould be Baptized, and though Infant-baptiſm was without any Original ſince the Apoſtles, yet it was not a forced thing. And were it in my power, it ſhould be ſo ſtill, I would not deny Chriſtian-love, nor Church communion, nor publique Encouragements to any pious peaceable man for being an Anabaptiſt. *I am not therefore half ſo Zealous to turn men from* Anabaptiſtry, *as I am to perſwade both them and others to live together with mutual forbearance in Love and*

Church-

Church-communion, notwithſtanding ſuch differences, page 221. *I make no queſtion but many of them are far better men than I, and knowing my ſelf liable to Error*, &c. *I am far more offended at their Separation than their Opinion*, page 228.

I know not by any Scripture or Reaſon that Re-baptizing is ſo hainous a ſin as ſhould warrant us to contemn at our Brethren, page 233.

By which you ſee Mr. *Baxter* is not ſo much offended with the *Anabaptiſts*, as their Separation. To which we ſay; Let Mr. *Baxter* by his Elaborate Syſtems, and ſubtil Diſtinctions, firſt convince the *Pædo-Baptiſts* of their error herein, as the *Independants*, and others, and eſpecially his Friend Mr. *Wills*; who though he hath Written ſo much for Infant-Baptiſm, yet ('tis well known) he is a wide Separatiſt. May not the Church of *Rome* cry out againſt Mr. *Baxter* for his Separation? Might not the Church of *England* do ſo formerly? And may they not ſtill, (yea Mr. *Baxter* alſo) cry out againſt Mr. *Wills* and his party? and ſay they are Rigid *Independents* and *Separatiſts*? What means then all this Out-cry againſt the *Antipædo Baptiſts*? unleſs they would have us believe that they are ſuch Univerſal Dictators as have Authority over Faith, and are Infallibly inſpired to propound Rules for all others, that when they Separate we muſt; and where they have Communion, ſo muſt we?

Now if Mr. *Baxter* will vouchſafe to do Two Thing ſ:

1. Tell us of what Church he is of.

2. Prove that Church to be rightly Conſtituted according to the Primitive Pattern: We will not then Separate from him. In the mean time we judge it

our duty, whereunto we have already attained, to Walk by the ſame Rule. And if any be otherwiſe-minded, we hope the Lord will in time reveal it unto them. *Amen.*

FINIS.

ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon a Late Book, Intituled,

INFANT-BAPTISM

From HEAVEN and not of MEN,

In Answer to Mr. *Henry Danvers* his Treatise of

BAPTISM.

WHEREIN

Believers Baptism in Opposition to Infants (pretended) Baptism, is further Vindicated and Confirmed: And, that Believers only are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, is also further Evidenced, against the Exceptions of Mr. *Joseph Whiston*.

By *E. H.*

Non adeo perdite confidens sum, ut ausim aliquid affirmare, quod Sacra Scriptura silentio praterit. Theodoret. i. e.

I am not so desperately confident, that I dare affirm any thing which the Holy Scripture doth pass by in silence.

Grace doth not run in a Blood, neither is the love of God Tyed or Entailed upon any Linage of Men: *Caryl* on *Job*, cap. 5.

43.
4 6.
412

The Preface to the READER

Courteous Reader:

THE *Delay of the Fore-going* Treatiſe *in the* Printer's *hands gave me Opportunity to peruſe, and briefly to Animadvert upon Mr.* Whiſton's *Book, wherein I find a promiſing Title, and very little more: To Trace him in all his Meandrous Digreſſions would be an Argument I want other Buſineſs: The main ſtrength of his Objections is in the ſaid* Treatiſe *fully Enervated; and I do not think my ſelf concerned to purſue him, when he inſiſts upon matters beſides the* Queſtion *in Debate: His Exceptions touching the matter of* Antiquity, *are ſubſtantially anſwered by Mr.* Danvers, *yet ſhall be briefly glanced upon here.*

I ſhall not now Diſpute whether it be Generouſly done by Mr. Whiſton *to aſſail with ſo much Violence, one that's already beſet with ſuch clamarous* Adverſaries *as Mr.* Baxter, *and Mr.* Wills: *But he gives the Curious ſome occaſion to queſtion, that either (he thinks) they want* Relief, *being very near a* Defeat; *or have not ſo ſingular a Talent as himſelf to ſet off a* bad Cauſe. *For*

For my part I cannot conjecture what his deſign is, unleſs by making up a Triumvirate *of Champions, he thinks to carry the Cauſe by Clamour, and ſo ſhare of the Applauſe their admiring Votaries are liberal enough of. But as his Book needs little more Confutation than to be peruſed, ſo the infirmity of his Reaſoning, ſerves to illuſtrate, not foil the* Truth *he invades.*

Our Adverſaries themſelves are forced to confeſs that moſt of thoſe great Fathers (the generality of Chriſtians are ſo fond of) have been of Corrupt *Principles, and tainted with* Superſtitious *conceits, and* unſound Notions; *and that there are but very few of them to be found throughly Orthodox, though of great* Learning, Zeal, *and* Induſtry; *which is an* Item *to us not to* lean *upon the* Authority *of man, though never ſo* Celebrated *by Ages and Nations, but to have recourſe to the* Word *of truth left for our Inſtruction, and to ſeek our Warrant for Religious Duties there.*

This conſideration ſatisfies me, That this Triumviri *(however acted by confidence, or ſelf-conceit,) may be out of the way, and that their Dictates are no farther to be received, than they agree with the Word of God. The perplexing* Syſtems *ſpun out of mans own brain,*

brain, nice ſubtil Diſtinctions, and long-winded periods, may be taking with ſuch as are firmly Eſpouſed to a Party right or wrong, or ſuch as think him Conqueror that has moſt words: but the ſober enquiring Soul, that ſeeks Truth, not Victory, will eaſily perceive the Vanity and Error of ſuch a procedure.

Error *cannot be diſputed againſt, without giving it its name, and its Abettors cannot be reproved, nor admoniſhed but in words accomodated to their miſtakes, which indeed is not Railing, but plain-dealing; and which I hope is Apology enough for me, if any Expreſſions ſhould ſeem to be of too acute an Edge: The Scripture commands us to* reprove Errors ſharply, *or* (αποτόμως) cuttingly, Tit. 1. 13. *I love the Godly* Pædo-Baptiſt *as one that I know my Maſter* Chriſt *loveth, but having ſuch a Call to Witneſs to, and Contend for his Truth. I will (as he ſhall enable me) do it without daubing on the one, and unneceſſary ſharpneſs on the other hand. I know how to diſtinguiſh between ſuch as by a miſtaken Zeal utter provoking raſh words; and ſuch as in purſuance to their Duty* contend earneſtly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints: *And that Believers Baptiſm is ſuch an Ordinance as Chriſt delivered to his Saints, I never heard doubted: And that*

Infant

Infant (pretended) Baptiſm is not ſuch, is our work to manifeſt.

After all the Clutter our Antagoniſts kept to find ſome Evidence for the practice of Pædo-Baptiſm *in* Fathers, Councils, *&c. (the Scripture as they fully own being ſilent about it) they are glad to run for refuge at laſt to their new Invention of a* Covenant *they imagine to be made with the Carnal* Seed *of Believers,* Gen. 17. 7. *which they ſay Intitles them to be Baptized, but to no other Ordinance under the New Teſtament (a moſt pittiful Paradox) and being aſhamed to own the miſtaken abſurd* Mediums, *its old and moſt celebrated Patrons have Inſiſted upon for its* Support *in Old Times, they have Center'd in a more plauſible pretence for it, viz. the aforeſaid* Covenant, *which is their only* Reſerve *at preſent. And I cannot but admire that Men of any Reaſon ſhould cry up* Antiquity, Antiquity, *at the Rate they do, when at the ſame Inſtant they reject the Grounds and Reaſons the Ancients uſed for the ſame. And is it fair to derive the practice from* Antiquity, *and add Reaſons of their* Own, *when the Old Reaſons are found to be indeed Irrational. We know* Infant-Baptiſm *has been of an Early Birth, (viz. in the* Third *or* Fourth Century) *to ſave the Child's*

Child's Soul, and upon a miſtake that it might be Damned *without it*; *But* Infant-Baptiſm *upon the modern ground of a* Hereditary Covenant, *is new, and altogether unknown to the Ancient* Pædo-Baptiſts, *as by other hands is clearly made good. And how plauſible this New Argument is, in the following Pages is examined.*

And before I come to a particular Survey *of this preſent Undertakers Book, I would tender to his Chriſtian conſideration, hoping him to be a man that Fears God, Whether it be ſo conſiſtent with his Profeſſion, in ſo Taunting and proud a manner, to ſcorn and reproach his Opponent, whereas a meeker way would be (not only his Duty, but) more graceful?*

2. *Whether it be conſiſtent with the Word of Truth to go about to impoſe his bare* Ipſe dixit's *upon the World, without any material proof from the Scripture?*

3. *Whether it be conſonant to the plainneſs of the Goſpel, to confound rather than Inſtruct the ordinary plain Reader with ſuch a variety of needleſs impertinent* Diſtinctions, Hypotheticals, Tedious *and* rambling Circumlocutious, Preambles, *and dark miſerable* ſhiftings, *to find a Covert for his* Jadorantiſm *in the Word of God?*

4. *Whether*

4. *Whether it be Ingenuous or Honeſt to ſupply the want of Argument with ſuch phraſes as theſe*, proceeding from Immodeſty to Impudence. Warning his Reader to be wary of crediting any of his (*viz.* Mr. *Danver's*) perſwaſion, can any man think he had any true actual Fear of God before his Eyes. Down-right Falſities, Forgeries, meer Cheats, *&c. though not the leaſt Tittle of them proved to be juſtly chargeable upon Mr.* Danvers.

And to all which, I think (*as it is the product of an Unruly provoking Spirit, actuated by prejudice, and its ireful concomitants*) *the beſt return will be ſilence. Let him conſider* Gal. 6. 1. Mat. 5. 5.

We ſhall not Inſiſt upon his uncomely carriage throughout the whole Book, we leave it to his cooler conſideration, and the Reader's Obſervation, and ſhall preſent you with a brief account of his Book, and then Select what wants our Reply, and leave all to the judgment of the Reader.

The Book conſiſts of Two parts; 1. An attempt to weaken the Humane Authority urged by Mr. *Danvers* for Illuſtration of Believers Baptiſm, in oppoſition to Infants Baptiſm. 2. To Confute him in the Doctrinal part.

About

About the first he spends 24 *pages*; *his Objections are some scraps of what Mr.* B. *and Mr.*W. *have more at large urged, and already Answered by Mr.*D. *of which nevertheless I shall anon take a brief View.*

From p. 25. *to* 71. *he goes about to disprove* that Believers Baptism is only Christ's Baptism. 2. *To prove* that the silence of the Scripture about Infant-Baptism tends more to its establishment than overthrow. 3. To vindicate Tradition, as he defines it. *viz.* the Discoveries made by the Church Doctrinally and Practically from the Apostles time to us, as a subordinate means whereby we come to know, and are more fully confirmed what's contained in the Doctrine of the Apostles. 4. From *page* 71. *to* 129. *he* considers the Arguments from the Covenant, and Fœderal Holiness. 5. *From page* 129. *to the end, He* endeavours to prove the Validity of Baptism, as Administred by Sprinkling. *Of which in Order.*

ANIMADVERSIONS UPON Mr. *Whiſton*'s Book, &c.

HE Intitles his Book, *Infant Baptiſm from Heaven and not of Men*: This indeed may raiſe the *Expectation* of ſuch as have not Read Mr. *Baxter's Plain Scripture proof*. I began to think he had lighted upon ſome *Rarity*, elſe he would not Front his Book with ſuch a Title, nor trouble the World eſpecially at this juncture, when ſuch men of *Noiſe* are already Engaged againſt us. But *Empty* Casks give the greateſt ſound, and pregnant Mountains bring forth a Mouſe. *From Heaven?* and has he been there then, and ſearcht the *Records*, and was of the *Cabinet Counſel* of the Almighty? what if we doubt it? we have but his bare word for it. He muſt pardon me if I ſay *Infant-Baptiſm from* (Rome *or*) *beneath*; for if it had been of Heavens making, the Scriptures (*and the Records, and Hiſtories of the pureſt Primitive times*) would not be ſo ſilent about it, as the moſt Learned *Pædo-baptiſts* confeſs, and particularly Mr. *B.* our keeneſt Adverſary is forced to own they are. But the Author is cunning, and would Decoy the *Reader* by a ſpecious Title; ſo the Vintners gaudy ſign often Trapans to a coſtly (though unwholſome) Entertainment. The plain *Scripture-proof man* himſelf confeſſes *Infants baptiſm has its conſiderable*

ſiderable difficulties; the Ingenious Papiſt counts it *a Miracle to have it proved by Scripture*. Moſt of the Learned *Pædo-baptiſts* have recourſe to *Tradition* for help, and how come they to miſs of this mans Invention all this while? This *Apollo*, this *Oepidus*, this *Alexander* which you will, might have done good ſervice to unriddle the *Ænigma*, or cut that knot, the unfolding of which coſt ſo much Debate. Had he brought that from Heaven ſooner, (which was ever there) he had ſaved many Learned men the labour of their Elaborate Syſtems *pro* and *con*. But this *Author* has as dexterous and nimble a way of confuting all *Antiquity*, as the Junior Sophiſter in *Oxford* uſed with *Bellarmine*, when he writ in the end of his Works, *Bellamine thou lieſt*; therefore I will make bold to tell him that he ſtamps his *uncertain* Conjectures with a Divine *Character*, and fathers his Forgeries and contrivances upon *Heaven*; which is a daring piece of Confidence, to ſay no more. So that I ſhall ſay of him, and from juſt ground, as the Poet of *Pigmalion*, extreamly doting upon the fair Image he made, *Operiſq; ſui concepit amorem*, &c.

He tells us, Mr. *Danvers his Book is all Forgery*, *which he leaves to the Readers Obſervation*, *wiſhing him to have a care of crediting any of his perſwaſion.* But if this be not Inconſiſtent with the Laws of *Ingenuity*, *Equity*, and the *Generoſitie* of a Scholaſtick Education, I know not what is. Had he been as nimble to attacque the Cauſe we maintain, as we find him a keen Satyriſt againſt the perſon he Oppoſes, who never gave him the leaſt Provocation, it would be more honeſt and taking. But inſtead of a *fair unprejudiced* Examination of our Arguments, he lates

bout him terribly, and deals his ſtrokes unmercifully, charges the whole with *Forgery*, *Falſhood*, and what not? without vouchſafing to tell us wherein thoſe Forgeries and Falſhoods lye. [But ſtay Sir, as lofty a conceit as you have of your ſelf, wee'll not believe you upon your bare word. Have you hit upon that pernicious Knack of aſſaſſinating mens credit at a breath? It ſeems you ſcorn to be ſuch a *petty Chapman* as Mr. *W's.* (who comes to Particulars, but) you would knock us down by whole Sale. You leave the Reader *to his own obſervation.* And is that all? as if he had ſtood gaping till you become his *Monitor*, could not the Reader make his Obſervations without this impertinent *memento?*]

Be wary of crediting any of his perſwaſion.] In this I would appeal to *Mr. Whiſton's* Conſcience, or any ſpark of common ingenuity, whether it be juſt and honeſt for him to charge the whole party of *Anti-pedo baptiſts* at this rate, although Collonel *Danvers*, (as 'tis poſſible a Learned man may) had been miſtaken in ſome things among ſo numerous a Tract of *Quotations*? of which he has made no ſignificant diſcovery neither.) Would he think it fair dealing, if we ſhould improve the particular errors or miſcarriages of *Pædo Baptiſts* to the ſcandal of all under that denomination? particularly the apparent Injuſtice, and unchriſtian Dealings of Mr. B. and *Mr. W's.* in their late conſpiracy, wrongfully to impeach us, and the truth we profeſs; and their malicious Contrivances in proſecution thereof, fully detected by another hand.

And whether we have not juſt ground to conclude his *Infant-baptiſm is not from Heaven*, not only from the weakneſs of his Arguments, but from his manner

of

of Arguing alſo? the Apoſtles way being to convince in meekneſs, and confute in terms full of Love, and void of all Opprobrious and Canting Railery. The Scripture tells us, that *the wiſdom that is from Above, is firſt pure, then peaceable, gentle, and eaſie to be intreated, full of mercy and good Works, without partiality, and without Hypocriſie, James* 3. 17. Whereas he accoſts us in ſo haughty and domineering an Equipage, as he thinks will cruſh and diſable us from any farther Encounters with ſo dreadful a *Gigas* as he takes himſelf to be. Expoſing us to the ſcorn and odium of the whole World, as if we had not felt enough of its unkindneſs, till he comes to open the mouth of *Calumny* wider, and make our Enemies bawl louder. But theſe things we hope our Lord God, whom we deſire to ſerve, will give us patience to *endure* for his Name and Truths ſake.

But to put the better face upon the matter, he pretends to give ſome inſtances of *Mr. Ds.* his *unfaithfulneſs* in his Quotations, and of a great many picks out two (with ſingular judgment) which he thinks he can toſs to the purpoſe, and makes his Reader ſport to ſee how ridiculous he would make them. But to check his triumphant Inſultings, we ſhall joyn iſſue with him in the fair Tryal of thoſe particulars he impeaches.

1. He charges Colonel *Danvers* for unfaithfulneſs in affirming that *the Magdeburgs* ſay in the place he cites, *That in the firſt Century, they find they baptized only the Adult or Aged, &c. whereas the Word only is not there.* This Exception *Mr. Ws.* made, and is anſwered by *Mr. D.* in *p.* 31, 32. of his *Reply*, and I conceive it is no part of ingenuity in *Mr. Whiſton* to be inculcating that which he could not be ignorant was

ſo juſtly replyed to already. But

What if Mr. *D.* has been in the *right*, and the *falſhood* be laid at *Mr. Whiſtons* door? is not *Mr. Whiſton* then the unfaithful man? and that it is ſo, the Reader is deſired to conſider, that what we deſire to prove from the *Magdeburgs* is matter of Fact, *viz.* whether Infants were Baptized in that Age, which in plain terms they tell us they read no Example of, *Exempla annotata non leguntur*; and that the Adult of *Jew* and *Gentile* were Baptized, as is exemplified *Acts* 2. 8,10,16,19,*&c.* and is not this Equivalent with what he alleges, *viz.* that they Baptized only the Adult, finding examples for the one, and not for the other; any man in his ſences may ſee that there is no more difference between them, than there is between two ſix pences and a ſhilling. We confeſs the *Magdeburgs* were for Infant-Baptiſm, and that they cite *Origen* and *Cyprian* as Authors, that it was an Apoſtolical Tradition, in theſe words, *Sed* Origines *&* Cyprianus *&* *alii Patres Authores ſunt Apoſtolorum etiam tempore baptizatos eſſe*; Conſtat *enim hoc ex Apoſtolorum Scriptis quod Infantes a Baptiſmo non excludant, nam dum Circumciſionis locum Baptiſmum ſupplere* Paulus *docet*, Col. 2. *Atque Infantes atque Adultos ad Baptiſmum admittendos judicat*; that is, Origen *and* Cyprian, *and other Fathers, tell us, that in the Apoſtles time ſome were Baptized; for this is evident from the Apoſtles Writings, that they did not exclude Infants from Baptiſm, and where* Paul *teaches*, Col. 2. *that Baptiſm ſucceeds in the place of Circumciſion*, he declares *that Infants as well as the Adult are to be admitted to Baptiſm.*

The Reader is deſired to note how Craftily Mr. *Whiſton* ſtops in his Quotation at the words *Conſtat*

ex

ex Apoſtolorum Scriptis, i. e. it is *evident from the Apoſtles Writings*, to make the Reader believe they mean it (that Infants were Baptized,) whereas it relates to the following part of the ſentence, *viz.* (*Quod Infantes a baptiſmo non excludant*, *that they did not exclude Infants from Baptiſm*, rendring himſelf guilty of what he unjuſtly accuſes Mr. *D.* But to the Quotation:

Wherein we have Three Things urged by them as Arguments for their practice; Firſt the Teſtimony of *Origen* and *Cyprian* Secondly, Arguments from Infants non-excluſion from Baptiſm Scriptures. Thirdly, an Inference to prove it lawful as ſucceeding Circumciſion.

1. The Teſtimony of *Origen* and *Cyprian*, this I ſhall ſay little to, being ſubſtantially enervated by *Mr. Danvers* already in his *Rejoynder*, where it is made out, (1.) that *Origen* and *Cyprian* ſay no ſuch thing; (2.) that if they had, its no great matter; the Books being from juſt grounds judged ſpurious: (3.) that if the Books were genuine, their Teſtimonies in the *Third Century* is not ſufficient to prove matter of *Fact* the Firſt Age.

2. The Arguments from Infants non Excluſion being *Mr. Whiſton's* dear Argument ſo oft repeated, and made ſuch a flouriſh withall, and filling a good part of his Book, our Anſwer ſhall be refered to the place where he urges it.

3. The Inference from Circumciſion; this *Mr. Whiſton* in expreſs terms tells us, is not made any ground of Infant Baptiſm by them in theſe words, We plead not for Infants Baptiſm, meerly from the Analogy it bears to Circumciſion (and is angry they ſhould be charged with it, (though his practice contradicts

the expreſſion very often, as well as the *Magdeburgs* thereby) therefore I ſhall not ſpend time to diſprove that which he owns not. The Second Inſtance he gives of *Mr. Ds.* unfaithfulneſs, is, *page* 7. *Mr. D.* ſayes thus: As to Baptiſm in the *Second Century*, they ſay *Cent.* 2. *cap.* 6. *p.* 109. that it doth not appear by any approved Author that there was any Variation or Mutation from the former, *Which Mr.* Whiſton is angry for, and ſayes, *Mr.* D. *would make people believe he ſpake this of the ſubject of baptiſm, whereas it is of the Rites and Ceremonies.*

I have Examined what *Mr. Danvers* ſayes, and that *Century*, and I find that he mentions neither ſubject nor rite, but only cites their words, and applies it as fairly; their words are, *Simplicem baptizandi formam fuiſſe retentam ex eo apparet, quod in probatis autoribus nulla inſignis reperitur variatio aut mutatio annotata. It is apparent that the ſimple (or old) form of baptizing was kept (viz.* in the *Second Age*) becauſe no remarkable Variation or Mutation is noted by any approved Author, and that this comprehends both the ſubject and way of Adminiſtration of the firſt Age, is evident to ſuch as are not critically contumacious and blind; and it is very probable, yea certain, that had the *Magdeburg's* found any Example for Infant-Baptiſm in this Age more than in the former, they would not fail to mention it; and though they ſay, *Nec uſquam legiter Infantes hoc ſæculo remotos eſſe, that we read not of Infants being excluded in this Age*, we may as truly ſay, *Nec uſquam legitur Infantes hoc ſæculo baptizari; We read of no Infants baptized in this Age*: So that it is a ſure Argument the thing was not in being, becauſe no mention is made of it, as practiced or not

practiced

practiced. I have read the Story of the *Jew*, which he upbraids Collonel *D* for over-looking, *who like to dye, was upon his earneſt requeſt baptized* (as they call it) *by his fellow Travellers, by flinging Sand upon him, there being no poſſibility of having Water there.* But what advantage this makes for *Mr. Whiſton*, we know not, let him make the beſt of it; if he had thought it ſo much for his purpoſe, why did not he mention it? but he choſes rather to make the Reader believe there is ſomething in it for his advantage, when indeed it ſignifies nothing for him.

The Second thing he remarks, is the impertinency of his proofs, and of which he gives Five Inſtances, how proper we are now to enquire. But firſt, Is it not unjuſt for *Mr. Whiſton* to charge his Adverſary with that Crime whereof he himſelf is notoriouſly guilty; as I could inſtance if I would be impertinent, and for a taſte will begg the Readers pardon to remark one. Is it to *Mr. Whiſton's* purpoſe, or does the Argument he manages require it, that he ſhould publiſh in print (firſt part of his Infant-Baptiſm) *that he is a Batchelor, &c.* is the World concerned in the changes of his ſtate? or does he think that by the Charms of his Wit and Oratory, ſome great *Cometiſſa* will fall in Love with him? Is not that as impertinent a Proclamation as the *Eccleſiaſtical Politician's* publiſhing his *dull and lazy diſtemper?* I would not have ſaid this, but to ſhew how he that's ſo nimble to fall upon others in print, ſhould take care firſt to amend himſelf.

And as to his Exceptions under this head, they are indeed ſo frivolous and inſignificant, that it is in vain to ſpend time to refute that which any Reader may do in the very peruſing; for what does he more than

than pick up some scrips here and there, pickeering at a part as the preamble (or that that makes way) to the main thing, wherein all the *force* is put, and to which these passiges he snatches up may be only Circumstantial.. So that *Mr. Whiston* beats the Ayre, and fights manfully with a *Figment* of his own brain. For,

1. The piece of the *Waldensian* Confession, which he sayes *is not to our purpose*, is but an Introduction to the *7th. Article* in the same page, which sayes, *That by baptism we are received into the Holy Congregation of the people of God, declaring openly our Faith, &c.* which our Answerer takes no notice of.

That of *Vignier* is pertinently enough brought, wherein the *Waldenses reject all Doctrines which have not their foundation in Scripture, and all Ceremonies and* Romish *Traditions*; because the Baptism of Infants at that time was practiced from that ground. And that he gives a testimonial of them, that they denyed Infants Baptism *in totidem Verbis*; See what he sayes, (*viz. Nicholas Vignier* in his Book called *la Vrave Histoire de l'Eglise*, p. 354. upon the year 1136. speaking of the *Waldenses* and some of their principal Barbs, where he hath these words, *Et qu'ils condamnoient le Bapteſme de Petits Enfans alleguans que le Bapteſme n'aportoient qu' a ceux qui ont foi. i. e. And they condemned the Baptizing of little Infants, alledging that Baptism belongs to none but those that have Faith.*

As to the agreement between the *Donatists* and *Novations*; it is also properly enough applyed, for all *Mr. Whiston's* haste, as the following words of *Mr. Ds.* make out, *viz.* they held, *That none ought to be received into Churches, but such as were visibly true Be-*

lie-

lievers, and read Saints, &c. The way of being received into the Church, Mr. *W.* knows to be Baptiſm, but he overlooks this alſo.

As to the Three other Particulars out of the *Waldenſian Confeſſions*, p. 282, 283, 284. 1 *Ed.* he Excepts againſt, as not to our purpoſe, let the ſame return ſerve them as before.

That out of *Thuanus* from *Dr. Uſher*, viz. *that the* Beringarians *held that Baptiſm did not profit Children to Salvation* is a proper and ſuitable Argument of their denying Infant-Baptiſm, it being elſewhere evidenced (and which *Mr. Whiſton* nor his Aſſociates never Anſwered) that that was the only ground of its adminiſtration, *viz.* that it Saved the Child's Soul.

3. As to his Charge of *Mr. Ds. perverting Authors* ſayings, viz. *Pædo-baptiſts in general*, it is already fully cleared by himſelf in his *Rejoynder* to *Mr. W's.* and to him the Reader is referred. 2. *Mr. Whiſton* would have us ſhew, *wherein lyes the inconſiſtency of their words with their practice*; which is alſo fully done. But me thinks it might be a properer task for themſelves to reconcile their *Contradictions*, which they are loudly called to do, if they can; and ſo either yield up the Cauſe, or remove the ſtumbling *blocks* they themſelves lay in our way.

4. He ſays, *Some of Mr. Ds. Authorities are againſt himſelf*, and inſtances *Mr. Baxter*, (we confeſs he is ſometimes againſt us to the purpoſe, but ſometimes he is alſo kind enough, and gave us Twenty good Arguments improved by *Mr. Tombs* in his *Felo de Se.*) But for the reſt 'tis but meer prattle. *Chryſoſtom* is inſtanced, to ſhew the Erroneous ground upon which Infant-Baptiſm was practiced, *viz.* to take

away Original Sin; and if it be a proof for *Mr. Whiſton*, let him take it, I'll give him another proof too if that will pleaſe him out of his Friend *Auſtin*; 23 *Epiſt.* ad Bonif. *Nec illud te moveat, quod quidam non ea fide ad Baptiſmum precipiendum parvulos ferunt, ut gratia ſpirituali ad vitam regenerentur Æternam, ſed quod eos putant hoc remedio temporalem retinere, ac recipere ſanitatem, non enim propterea illi non regenerantur, quia non ab illis hac intentione offeruntur, celebrantur enim per eos neceſſaria Miniſteria.* But he muſt excuſe me if I leave him the pleaſure of Tranſlating it, ſeeing he may perhaps do it to moſt advantage.

That *Peter Bruis* and *Henricus* denyed Infants Baptiſm, we have good ground to believe from many ſubſtantial Reaſons offered by *Mr.* D. and if we reject the teſtimony of *Papiſts* (in whoſe hands moſt of our ancient Writings have been for ſome Centuries, which we are well enough ſatisfied to do) in this, why not in other things?

That *Cluniacenſis* (owned to be a very learned man) diſputed with *Peter Bruis*, and *Henry*, is evident; he layes down their Poſition to be this:

Nos vero tempus congruum fidei expectamus, & hominem poſtquam Deum *ſuum cognoſcere, & in eum credere paratus eſt, non ut nobis imponitis, Rebaptizamus ſed Baptizamus, quia nunquam baptizatus dicendus eſt, qui baptiſmo quo lavantur peccata, locus non eſt.* i. e. *We wait for the fit ſeaſon of Faith, and when a man knows his God, and believes in him, we baptize him, not rebaptize as you charge us; for he cannot be ſaid to be ever baptized, that is not waſht with the baptiſm that waſheth away ſins.* And then makes this pathetick declamation againſt them, enumerating

ting the Absurdities he fancies that follow their Opinion; he saith thus: *Itane desipuere præterita sæcula, & tot millibus parvulorum per mille & eo amplius annos illusorum baptisma tribuerent*, &c. which I thus English.

And have past Ages been so foolish, and have given but a mock-baptism to so many thousand Little ones, for this thousand years and more, and from Christs time to ours have made them not real, but fantastick (or imaginary) Christians? Was the whole World so blinded and involved in so huge a mist of darkness hitherto, that it must wait for you at length to open its eyes, and to dispel so tedious a Night, that after so many Fathers, Martyrs, Popes, *and* Princes *of the Universal Churches, it must chuse* Peter Bruis *and* Henry *his Lackey as the last Apostles to correct its long error? What hath all the World perished till the coming of these New Reformers of our Age, and have all things been managed by the Sons of Light and Truth in darkness and falshood, that whereas all of any Age or Rank having been baptized in Infancy, and received their Christian name then, and in convenient time have been preferred in divers degrees in the Church, no* Bishop *of the Bishops, no* Priest, *no* Deacon, *no* Clerk, *no* Monk, *not one as I may say of those innumerable numbers, will be a Christian? for whosoever is not baptized with the Baptism of Christ, hath not Christ, nor can he be of the Clergy, People, or Church And if it be so, what manifest absurdities will follow. For whereas all* France, Spain, Germany, Italy, *and all* Europe *for almost three hundred or four hundred years, have none baptized but in Infancy, they have therefore no Christian, if no Christian, then no Church; if no Church, no Christ; and if no Christ, then certainly they are damned. Our Fathers therefore*

have

have perished, because they could not be baptized with Christs baptism in their Infancy; And we that live shall also perish, unless after Christs Baptism we be Baptized with Henries Baptism also. *And innumerable of the Saints shall be pluck'd down from Heaven to the Infernal Seats, whom though baptized in Infancy, their life by its Holiness, the World by its testimony, and Divinity by Miracles have made famous; they must be made the Collegues of Devils, who were the Companions of Angels; and they that through their pious Labours are arrived to Eternal life, will suddenly be flung into everlasting death. Our Holy dayes shall be turned to mourning, our Sabbaths into shame, and our Honour into nothing. Who can bear these? who can hear it? who would not shut his ears, and with all those they labour to damn, would not rise against these Arch Hereticks? But come unto me, and repent of so great a Prodigie. You scorn and deride* that one should be Saved by the Faith of another, *denying it with great Mockery among the Rusticks and unlearned Multitude.* A brutish and impious Heresie. *Petrus Cluniacensis, contra Petro brusianos haret.* p. 1124. Edit Paris 1614.

As to those late Authors, he sayes, whose testimonies *deserve no credit*, as to the first Ages, *viz. Willifrid, Strabo, Boemus, Lud. Vives.* I conceive however they are to be believed as soon as *Mr. Whiston.* And he that leans so much upon *Origen* and *Cyprian*, (though those Books Father'd upon them are judged spurious) to prove matter of Fact in the *First Age*, though they lived in the Third Century, should clear himself, before he falls foul upon others.

And Lastly, Since he declines all *Humane Authority*

rity as of no weight, ſo do we, and proceed to examine the Scripture grounds, which we deſire only to adhere to, and own it to be our Principle *to receive no Article of Faith, however entertain'd or cry'd up by Nations, Fathers, &c. that is not made Authentick by the Written Word of God.*

And whether Mr. *Danvers* (the Exceptions here made, being ſo few, and of ſo little weight) deſerves ſo ſevere a Caſtigation as this Author is pleated to give him, let the World judge.

And therefore we go on to try the oppoſition he makes as to the Doctrinal part. And firſt we affirm:

That *Believers Baptiſm is only Chriſt's Baptiſm*; which Mr. *Danvers* proved by the order laid down in the Commiſſion, *Matth.* 28. 19. to which Mr. *Whiſton* makes this demur; That *this Commiſſion doth not exclude Infants from Baptiſm, ſuppoſing their Baptiſm elſewhere in Scripture warranted.*

That this is a very ſorry Evaſion, will appear, if you conſider that this is the ſolemn Inſtitution and Commiſſion given to the Apoſtles, impowring them *to Preach the Goſpel, and Baptize*; and to charge it with darkneſs and imperfection (as Mr. *Whiſton* doth,) is to reflect upon the Law giver; and for us to obſerve any Order, but what is here laid down, is to go beyond our Commiſſion, and be wiſe above what is written. Which is not only our Opinion, but the great *Baſil*'s own words upon the place, ἐμῶς ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι, *&c. i. e.* But we think it neceſſary to have recourſe to the order preſcribed by the Lord, *viz.* firſt to Teach, then Baptize, *page* 636. *de Baptiſmo.*

2. It

2. It has been elſe-where ſufficiently proved that Infants (becauſe Unbelievers till Converted, *Eph.* 2. 3. and ſo uncapable of the qualification pre-required here) are excluded.

3. If it ſhould be urged that Infants have Faith (as ſeveral Learned *Pædo-baptiſts* affirm, though not ſo fortunate as to agree what kind of Faith, ſome being for a *Seminal*, ſome a *Federal*, ſome an *Imputative* Faith, *&c.* verifying the Proverb, *Tot capita, tot ſenſus,*) then we may conclude that there's no ſuch thing as Regeneration; for if we be Believers from the Womb, where is there any room for the New Birth? and if that be once admitted, the whole ſcope and frame of the Goſpel is ſubverted; for it would be an abſurd Errand to call ſuch to Believe, who are Believers by a Birth-privilcdg, and in a ſtate of Regeneration as ſoon as Born. But common Experience confutes this Childiſh fancy. And for that diſtinction (ſome of them make) of Faith in *actu primo*, or Potential Faith not yet grown up to actual, were it admitted (for which there is no Reaſon, the Maxim being juſt and ſafe, *Ubi lex non diſtinguit, non eſt diſtinguendum*; *Where the Law diſtinguiſhes not, we muſt not diſtinguiſh,*) yet it would not ſerve the turn, ſince Unbelievers Children may be as truly ſaid to have Faith in *Actu primo*, or potentially, as Believers Children, they proving frequently Converts, and precious Saints, whilſt Believers Children often run the broad way of Wickedneſs. Beſides if Children had ſuch a Faith, and that the diſtinction were (as it is not) good, it would not be enough, becauſe *no Faith but an actual perſonal Faith qualifies for Baptiſm.*

But

But he ſayes, *Suppoſing their Baptiſm elſe-where warranted in Scripture.*] But why is not that Scripture produced? 'tis much talk'd of, but we can never ſee it: which makes us conclude, that men that are ſo nimble to preſs Scriptures into their ſervice, that not a whit be-friend their Cauſe, if they could hit upon any ſuch plain Text, would be brisk enough to bring it forth. But alas! if they had their Warrant from Scripture, they would not take ſuch pains to prove *that the ſilence of the Scripture is ſuch an Argument to evince the lawfulneſs of their practice* [a very mad and wild way of reaſoning] nor run to the beginning of the World, to find ſome protection for it among the *Jewiſh* Rites. Goſpel Ordinances muſt be evidenced by Goſpel Authority. What inſtitution of the New Teſtament, but is plainly to be proved by New-Teſtament Scripture? Muſt Baptiſm alone (though ſo plainly, yea in words at length, both as to ſubject and form of Adminiſtration there inſtituted) be beholden to *Circumciſion*, *Gen.* 17. 7. for its Original? though as different and remote from it as the *Goſpel* is from the *Law*; If ſo, Why are not the Baptized Infants now admitted to the priviledges the Circumciſed were of old? *viz.* to be Members of the *Church* now, as they were then of the *Common-wealth*; to come to the *Supper*, as they to the *Paſſeover*, *&c.* this Riddle we deſire may be unfolded.

But he goes on in the ſame Tune, and tells us, *that as here is no expreſs mention of Infants* (that's well granted) *ſo no word, phraſe, or clauſe, that can be rationally interpreted to exclude them.*]

No more is there any word, phraſe, or clauſe excluding *Unbelievers* Children, nay which is more, not ſo much as a word, phraſe, or clauſe that (litterally)

excludes *Bells, Church walls, Standards, &c.* from Baptism; and if there be ground enough for this Author to Baptize them, let him take the Honor of the Employment.

He sayes, *Christ may have given this Commission only with reference to the Adult.* (that we believe and contend for; and 'tis now happily granted us,) *and may have sufficiently declared his will concerning the Baptism of Infants in other parts of his Word,* that's the thing he should prove, and that other part of his Word; if he knows it, he should direct us to, and so end the Controversie. We have read the *Bible* over and over, and can find no such thing we guess what he drives at, and believe hee'll settle at last in the Old shift of *Gen.* 17.7. But when he comes there, we are prepared to encounter him.

He saies *page* 28. *'Tis not necessary that our Lord Christ should expresly declare his whole mind in any part of his Word, nor not in the Commission it self, for the administration of them.* He would do well to forbear charging Christ with *Mental Reservations* in his Directions and Commissions to his APOSTLES. We think our selves concerned to obey that part of his will he is pleased to reveal to us, and that he exacts our Obedience no futher. And if Mr. *Whiston* durst do things in presumption, that they are that part of his *Will* he reveals not, so taking upon him to pry into the *Arcana* of God, we will not be of his Confederacy, nor Abettors to so desperate a piece of Arrogance. Hee'll find himself puzled to answer that Question, *Who hath required these things at your hands?*

He proceeds, and would make us believe, *that the Commission, Mat.* 28. 19. *is so intricate and insufficient,*

ent, that nothing of the principal things therein included, can be made out by it; and the better to make the Reader out of conceit with it, propounds five or six Queſtions, whether to puzzle, or give us work, or ſhew his dexterity in quibling, is not much to the matter. It is the diſcretion of Foxes to raiſe a duſt, that in the Obſcurity it makes, they may make an unobſerved retreat to their Hole, from the Hunts-man's purſuit. Our *Author* has learnt that policy; his meaning is involved in a Labyrinth of Obſcurities, and inextricable Meanders.

1. He tells us, if we will believe him, *That it is not determinable by the Commiſſion, Whether the Nations were to be Diſciples by Teaching or Baptizing.* That this is an idle Criticiſm will appear to any Body that underſtands the meaning of the Verb μαθητευσατε, which is to make Diſciples by Teaching, (for Baptiſm cannot make one a Scholar,) and βαπτιζοντες, the participle of the preſent-tenſe holds forth, that immediatly upon their being made Diſciples by the Word, they are to be added to the Church by Baptiſm; which is the interpretation that's exemplified by the Apoſtles, *Acts* 2. 41.

2. *Who among the Nations to whom the Goſpel is preached, ought to be accounted Diſciples, and as ſuch the proper ſubjects of Baptiſm?* This he propoſes as a knotty point, but as Ænigmatical as he would make it, we evidence the Juſtice of our practice by this Dilemma. Either Chriſt ſent them to Baptize all the World whether they will be Baptized or not, or ſuch only as receive their Doctrine: The former Mr. *Whiſton* will not, nor dares not avouch; therefore the latter anſwers his Queſtion. Beſides the Scripture plainly Reſolves it, (and that he cannot ſay of

his Infant Baptiſm for the dear ſake of which, he makes this clutter,) when it tells us, *That they were ſuch as gladly received the Word*, Act. 2. 41. *and ſuch as profeſſed they believed with all their hearts*, Act. 8 37. *&c.*

3. *Whether the Nations were to be Baptized as Diſciples, or as men?* the Reſolution of the former may be enough for this alſo; the Text ſaies, (Βαπτίζοντες,) *Baptizing*, but who? why certainly it muſt be (μαθητας.) *Diſciples*, underſtood in the Verb μαθητεύσατε, which exactly agrees with the Apoſtles practice, (the beſt Comment upon the Text) And if you refer the Pronoun αὐτοῖς, to τα ἔθνη, (which is falſe *Syntax* too, unleſs you run for refuge to the figure *Syntheſis*, which is, *Oratio congrua ſenſu non voce*) and to conclude that all the Nation whether Diſciples or not, are Baptizable; 'tis evident you pervert the meaning of Chriſt, and would make up a Synagogue of *Heathens*, inſtead of a *Chriſtian* Church.

4. *What the manner of Baptiſm is, whether to be adminiſtred by Dipping or Sprinkling?* this he ſaies is not determinable by the Commiſſion.

But we affirm, and he cannot deny, that the Word *properly* and *natively* ſignifies to *dip*, or plunge under water; never to ſprinkle; and therefore conclude it the ſafeſt way to keep to the proper meaning of the Word. If Sprinkling had been Chriſts way, he wanted not a fit expreſſion for it: And if he and his party durſt play the Critticks upon his words, and commit a Rape upon his very expreſſions, we durſt not joyn with them in it.

5. *Whether only Males, or both Males and Females ought to be Baptized* αὐτοῖς, *being the Maſculine gender?* He might as well raiſe this ſcruple, whether Females are concerned in moſt Chriſtian Duties, becauſe the Words

words of the Text are addreſt to the Male kind, the Maſculine as the moſt worthy, comprehending the other Gender. Is a Woman excluded from the duty of *Self-examination*, becauſe the Pronoun ἑαυτὸν is in the Maſculine Gender, 1 *Cor.* 11.28. or from the duty to *abide in the Calling whereunto ſhe is called*, becauſe ἕκαστος, (1 *Cor.* 7. 20.) is ſo? Doth not the Article οἱ reſpect both Man and Woman, οἱ δύο, they two ſhall be made one fleſh. And why we cannot be allowed the ſame liberty here, I know not.

Having raiſed this miſt, he thinks in the Obſcurity he has made about the Commiſſion, he might bring in Infant Sprinkling, that it may *lurk* there too, telling us that ſince theſe Particulars are as difficultly to be made out by the Commiſſion, as Infant-Baptiſm, he may have *recourſe to other Revelations* to evidence it.

Anſw. He might have had that liberty without making ſo Critical an Invaſion upon this grand *Commiſſion*. (2.) We take it as an inſtance of the unlikelihood of his producing any other *Revelation*, becauſe he tampers with the Commiſſion at that rate, and ſpins out time, never coming to any ſuch Revelation, wearying the Reader, with ſuch a Circuit and Maze of words, that he forgets the *beginning*, before he comes to the *end*. But (3*ly*.)

Let him from other Scriptures or Revelations make out, That Infant-Baptiſm is warranted in this Commiſſion as clearly and undeniably as we can Evidence, that *thoſe only ought to be Baptized* (in purſuance of it) *as gladly receive the word*, *Females*, as well as *Males* (being the thing he would make us believe are ſo indemonſtrable by it) and we ſhall ſubmit unto it; In the mean time, let him not take it ill, if we take no more notice of him, then of a man under a

great and radical miſtake, though he may perhaps expect as much Reverence as *Delphos*.

He ſaies, *p.* 32. *The very not mentioning Infants, does ſtrongly imply his will they ſhould be Baptized.*

That's a Conſequence I never heard before; and proves the Baptiſm of a *Turks* Child, or of *Bell*, as well as the Baptiſm he pleads for. But why ſo? becauſe Mr. *Whiſton* takes it for granted, *that Infants were Church-members under the Law, and this Commiſſion, nor no other Text in Scripture doth not repeal thoſe privileages.* Is that it? why then, let us examine whether this be ſound Doctrine.

And that it is not ſo, will appear from *Acts* 21.21. where you have plain Scripture-proof, that Infant-Church-membership is *repealed*. The words are; *And they are informed of thee, that thou teacheſt all the Jews, which are among the Gentiles, to forſake* Moſes, *ſaying, that they ought not to Circumciſe their Children, neither to walk after the Cuſtomes.*

Theſe words were ſpoken by the Elders of the Church at *Jeruſalem* to *Paul*; in which are theſe things to be conſidered.

1. A Report of a certain new Doctrine, that *Paul* had Preached among the *Jews*.

2. The Doctrine it ſelf, that they ought to forſake *Moſes, &c.*

Concerning the firſt, we are to examine, Whether *Paul* did Preach ſuch a Doctrine or no? 2. Whether the Doctrine he Preach'd were true?

For the firſt, it is evident that *Paul* did preach ſo, that *they muſt forſake Moſes, and not Circumciſe their Children, &c.* otherwiſe he need not have conſented to *puriſie* himſelf, and ſo far to *Judaize*, contrary to the Goſpel, and his own light; his denial only, of

the

the matter of *Fact*, would have been a ſufficient Confutation of ſuch a Rumor: But he denies it not (that would be to forſake his Goſpel-Miniſtry) but in a peaceable condeſcenſion, complies to purifie himſelf, that he may appear to be no Contemner of the Law, that removing their prejudice, he may have opportunity to preach *Chriſt* the Anti-type of all their Typical Adminiſtrations.

2. That alſo is undoubted, that the Goſpel-Doctrine he preached, *viz.* that the *Jews* and all others ought to forſake *Moſes*, *&c.* is true, and ſuitable to the Goſpel diſpenſation. If Mr. *Whiſton* denies it, he is more *Jew than Chriſtian*.

The next doubt is, What is meant by forſaking of *Moſes?* To which I Anſwer.

1. To forſake him as a *Prophet*, or *Miniſter* of the Goſpel Church, God having now raiſed up another *Prophet*, whom we muſt Hear in all things relating to the matter and manner of Worſhip in the Houſe of God: For though *Moſes* was faithful in his Houſe, as a Servant, yet he muſt give way to *Chriſt*, the *Great Prophet*, *Heb.* 3. and no longer give *Laws*, or preſcribe *Rules* about the matter or manner of Worſhip; yea nothing as to the Subject, Time, or Place, is to be received from him; but in all things we muſt be inſtructed by that *Prophet* that God hath *raiſed up from amongſt our Brethren:* this is the ſubſtance of *Paul*'s Doctrine.

2. *Not to Circumciſe their Children, is to forſake* Moſes, as the Text particularly makes out; becauſe Circumciſion was a Law or Doctrine they had learn't from *Moſes*; for though Circumciſion was firſt given to *Abraham*, yet it is called *Moſe's Law*, *John* 7.22. *Moſes therefore gave unto you Circumciſion, &c.*

But you must forsake this Law or Doctrine of *Moses*, and not Circumcise your Children any more. This sounds very Harsh, and was very grievous and offensive to them, that it caused such Fear in the Elders, that some Trouble and Hazard to his Person would follow; which was the ground of that Compliance in purifying themselves, to *pacifie* the *Jews* for the present; they being so exceeding zealous for the Law, and especially for Circumcising their Children, that Opposition was Death, or severe Punishment. Now had *Paul* told them, their Children should be *Baptized*, and that Baptism was come into the *room* of Circumcision, *&c.* in all likelihood it would have quieted them. But seeing there is no mention of any such thing, that He preached such Doctrine amongst them (which without Controversie would have been mentioned, had he done so) it plainly appears that *Paul* knew no such thing, neither had he any Commission to preach such Doctrine, as the Baptizing of Infants amongst them.

And this further is confirmed, if we consider the determination of the *First Council*, who were met about this very Doctrine of Circumcising Children, *&c.* that the *Jews* were still so zealous for, and knew not how to bear the Abrogation of it, (though they did believe in *Christ*,) and they would have enjoyn'd it upon the *Gentiles*, as necessary to Salvation, *Acts* 15. Now if it were a duty to Baptize Children instead of Circumcising of them, then the *Apostles* were unfaithful in not telling them of it, especially at this time, when there was so fair an opportunity to quiet their Consciences, and to put the matter out of doubt, and for ever to cashier the Doctrine of Circumcision; which we see the *Jewish* Teachers were after-

afterwards endeavouring to promote. But in regard the *Apoſtles* mention no ſuch thing as Baptizing of Infants in their debates in this Council, nor in their Letters they ſent to the *Churches*, it is evident they received no ſuch Commiſſion from *Chriſt*. And how any man can Believe otherwiſe, and not reflect *imprudence*, yea horrible *unfaithfulneſs* upon the *Apoſtles*, I cannot imagine.

The next to be conſidered in this Text is, that the *Jews* are alſo forbidden *to walk after the cuſtom*, that is after the *manner*, for ſo the word ἔθος is rendred, *Acts* 15. 1. *unleſs ye be Circumciſed after the manner of* Moſes, *&c.)* So that this word Cuſtom, or Manner of *Moſes*, prohibits not only all Obſervation of the Law of *Moſes*, but alſo all walking after the ſame *way* and manner, as the Ordinances of the Law were adminiſtred in. Here is not only an Injunction of non-conformity to the Law, but to the *manner* of it alſo. They are not only forbidden to Circumciſe their Children, but alſo to walk after the Cuſtom or Manner of Circumciſion; and therefore not to Baptize their Children. *Paul* might have ſaid, indeed to Circumciſe your Children was the Cuſtom and Manner of Old; but as for the Baptizing them, we have no ſuch cuſtom, nor the Churches of God.

And hence it is clear, that Infants Church-membership is repealed, and conſequently have no right to Baptiſm. For,

If Infants (as our Modern *Pædo-Baptiſts* alledge) *were virtually Commanded to be Baptized in the Command for Circumciſion*; and that Infant-Circumciſion, and Infant-Baptiſm were both Inſtituted *together* (as they that bring the later from *Gen.* 17. 7. muſt needs hold;) then they are both *uncommanded* again, in theſe very

very words, *Acts* 21. 21, where God by the mouth of *Paul* forbad them to *Circumcise* their Children any longer, and to walk after the Old Customs. I say again, if Infant-Baptism was commanded in the Command for Circumcision of Infants, then by Analogie (for *Contrariorum, contraria est ratio,*) Infant-Baptism must needs be abrogated, and remanded, in the abrogation and remanding of Circumcision. And though I do not believe, that the precept to Circumcise Infants, was so much as a Virtual or Consequential Command to Baptize them; yet it is an Argument *ad hominem* at least; and I hope the *Pædo-baptists* will be very willing to receive the same *measure* they give; and rest satisfied in this, that the *Countermand to Circumcise Infants is a Consequential and Virtual Countermand to Baptize them.* By all which it appears, that Infant-Church membership is repealed, because the same Law that gave being to it, is repealed. And whether this be not as plain (yea plainer) Scripture-proof, as any Mr. *R.* hath in his Book so Intituled, is left to the judgement of the Considerate and Impartial Reader.

Now he comes to it, and promises to direct us where those other Revelations of Gods will are, that Infants should be Baptized: And reading on very attentively, and going with patience through his preambular Extravagancies, and wide fetches, he brings me at last to the saying of *Peter* to the *Jews, The promise is to you and your Children*; and the words of *Paul* to a *Gentile, Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be Saved, and thy House*: Which put together, is his other Revelation (he brags so much of) for Infant-Baptism.

Answ.

Anſw. Now we are to encounter with all his ſtrength at once; therefore let us try the force of this mighty Argument. And,

1. If he can ſpell ſuch a meaning out of it, 'tis more than we can do; and if he had a mind to be underſtood, he ſhould expreſs himſelf in more familiar terms. As *what this promiſe was.* (2.) *Whether abſolute, or conditional.* (3.) *How Extenſive?* But ſince he hath left us in the dark, let us a little examine it.

1. *What this promiſe is?* And we ſay, that it muſt be either of ſome Temporal Bleſſing, or the Holy Spirit, as *Epheſ.* 1. 13. in this World; or Life and Salvation hereafter. The two firſt Mr. *Whiſton* will not pretend to, becauſe they have no reference to his Baptiſm. It is the laſt then, *viz. the promiſe of Life and Salvation*, he inſiſts upon, as *p.* 34. And then the words of *Peter* will run thus; *the promiſe* (of Life and Salvation (*is to you* (Jews) *and your Children, and to as many as are afar off*, which all agree to be the Gentiles, *and as many as the Lord your God ſhall call*, (i. d. infinitely without diſtinction, whether *Jew* or *Gentile.*)

Now this promiſe ſo paraphraſed, is either *Abſolute*, or *Conditional*: If abſolute, then all *Jews*, *Gentiles*, and their *Children* are Saved, whether they Believe or not: If you underſtand it conditionally, *viz.* that they firſt profeſs Faith in the *Meſſiah*, and receive him as their Saviour; then we are agreed.

And if you ſay, *It is Conditional to the Adult, not their Seed*: I anſwer, Then it muſt be abſolute to the Seed; if ſo, then all their Seed muſt needs be Saved. And then, How come ſo many of them to be ſo *vile* and *wicked?* if you ſay 'tis only to ſome; then it muſt follow,

follow, that some Believers Children ought only to be Baptized, *viz.* the Elect; but 'tis impossible to assign which are Elect, and which non Elect; therefore uncertain from that ground, which ought, and which ought not to be Baptized. And if you say, *the Covenant of Grace* (or promise of Life and Salvation) *be made to Believers Seed only*, and consequently they only have right to Baptism: then it will follow, that the Church is not to be raised out of the Posterity of Unbelievers, which is absurd; for the Gospel is to be Preached to *gather* in the Elect, *viz.* such as are in the Covenant of Grace: But if the Children of Believers only are in the Covenant of Grace, then to what purpose is the Gospel preached to the Posterity of Unbelievers, unless it be to harden them? for suppose a Nation of *Indians*, whose Parents were all Heathens, and who therefore (according to your Opinion) with their present Children, are not in the Covenant of Grace, Will you Preach to them? If you do, I ask you to what purpose? you'll say, To bring them into the Covenant of Grace. Then it seems there are two wayes to come into the Covenant of Grace; one by being the *Natural* Child of a Believer; the other by *Actual* Faith. But this is ridiculous, for there is no being in the Covenant of Grace, but by *Election* on Gods part; and *actual Faith* on Mans part.

And if you still say, That Believers Infants *only* are in the visible Covenant of Grace, and all the Seed of Unbelievers excluded; then I demand, Whether you do not make two Covenants of Grace, Visible, and Invisible? But if you deny that (for 'tis hard to know where to find you) and say your Children are Visibly in the Covenant of Grace, when others are not. I

Answer;

Anſwer; you delude us very often with the word (*Viſible*) for ſometimes your Infants are, ſometimes they are not in the Covenant (*viſibly*;) ſo that this term is as ambiguous and myſtical as words of *Cabal.* 2. But if you mean by *Viſibly*, that they are plainly and manifeſtly obvious to the view of all perſons that are capable of ſeeing in the Covenant, then we deny your Viſibility. And if you mean, by *Viſible*, that they are in the Covenant, as far as you can judg, ſince you know nothing to the contrary: We ſay the ſame of Unbelievers Infants; for they may be in the Covenant for any thing we know, nothing appearing in their Infancy to the contrary; and, *Præſumere unum quemq; bonum, niſi conſtet de malo*; is your own Rule.

3. If by (*Viſibly*) you underſtand outwardly, or in the outward part of the Covenant, which is Baptiſm; we anſwer, That Baptiſm is no more the outward part of the Covenant, than the *Purſe* that contains money is the outward part of the *money*; or the *Conduit* the outward part of the Water; or *Aarons* Pot that held the *Manna*, the outward part of the *Manna*. *&c.* For Baptiſm is a Symbol of Regeneration, *viz.* Faith, Repentance, Self-denial, *&c.* and to affirm, that it is the outward part of the Covenant, is a very Fancy, and meer *Chimæra.*

So that you ſee what a Heap of irregular Jarrings and Abſurdities follow the Aſſertion, that the Believers Carnal Seed, as ſuch, are to inherit this promiſe.

And now I am come to the next conſideration, which is, *The extenſiveneſs of this promiſe*; and this is determined in the Text, it is (*to all that are afar off*) equal to the Poſterity of *Abraham*; which ſpoils the pre-

pretence from the *Birth priviledge.* But what puts the matter out of doubt, is the next phraſe, (*Even as many as the Lord your God ſhall call;*) which expounds the former, and proves that calling (or Regeneration) is the condition of the promiſe, and that only ſuch as are called of *Jew, Gentile*, and their Children, are Inheritors of it, according to *Gal.* 3.29,

As to that expreſſion, *Believe in the Lord Jeſus, and thou ſhalt be Saved, and thy Houſe.* Is it Mr. *Whiſton*'s meaning, that all in the Houſe, Servants, Children, *&c.* are Saved, though Unconverted, by the Faith of the Maſter? (but that's a concluſion, he durſt not ſtand by:) Or is that promiſe of Salvation given to him, and his Houſhold, upon the condition of his and the Houſholds Faith individually? If this latter be his ſenſe, we joyn with him in it; but renounce the former as abſurd, and unſound: For if it were allowed, then one may be Saved by the Faith of another (a Fancy exploded by all Proteſtants) and ſo it were enough to Save all *England*, if every *Maſter* of a Family had been a Believer. I would ask Mr. *W.* if taking himſelf to be a Believer, he would Baptize his Servant, and believe him Saved, though an Unbeliever, upon that ground? If it be his Religion, his practiſe ſhall not be my example.

Beſides, if the Covenant promiſe, they ſo vehemently affirm to belong to Believers Children only, muſt be limited to them, and extend no further; how come Servants that are not ſo concerned in the Birth-priviledg, nor the Seed of Believers, to be pleaded for by this man, to have a right to Baptiſm and Salvation upon the Maſters Faith? We grant they have as much right to it, as the Children (that is none at all till Converted) for the Text ſaies, *Thou and thy Houſe,*

House, (and I presume the *Servant* is one of the House. So that a Believers Servant has as much right to be Baptized, as the Believers Child, though the Servant cannot pretend to be the Issue of Faithful Parents: And if so, What's the Reason they Baptize not their Servants, they having the same Title with their Children to it. And indeed if they will grant, that the Master, or Chief Man's Faith, is enough to intitle all his Family, or those under his Government to Baptism and Salvation; then if the *King* of *Spaine*, or the *Pope*, or Great *Turk* be Converted, 'tis enough to Warrant our *Pædo-Baptists* to Baptize not only all in their great *Courts*, but all that Inhabit their *Territories* also; their Subjects being their Servants. And how pure such a Doctrine is, that would force so gross an absurdity upon the Scriptures, let the World judge.

So that I humbly conceive it is very evident, that neither the one nor the other Scripture, jointly, or severally holds forth the promise of Salvation, or a right to Baptism to any one, upon any other account, than the *Condition of personal Faith*. And that Mr. *Whiston*'s confident boast of other Revelations is an empty flourish.

He saies, *p.* 35. *It was very rational, yea necessary, the Commission should be expresst in the Order it is, because those to whom the Apostles were sent, were in a state of darkness, and ignorance, wholly estranged from God and his wayes.*

That's a certain truth, which we oppose not; but is there not the same necessity still? Are not the Nations in a state of darkness, ignorance, and wholly estranged from God now, as well as then, till Converted? Are not the Infants you Sprinkle, *Children*

of

of Wrath as well as others? And therefore is it not as neceſſary that the preaching of the Gospel ſhould be antecedent to Baptiſm now, as (they confeſs) it was then? For my part I know no difference between a *Heathen* and an *Unbeliever*; they are both alike *diſtant* from God, and both equally *capable* of his converting Grace. And this ſerves for an Anſwer to this, as well as the two following Conſiderations, being of the ſame purport.

He affirms, *page* 37. *That the promiſe of Salvation, and Covenant of Grace, in which the promiſe is contained, is ſtill extended to the Houſes or Families of Believers, as ſuch.* To which I ſay, as before, that his ſayings would be more regarded, if he would condeſcend to *prove* them. But however, if he means it conditionally, *viz.* if they believe, they may be Baptized, and Saved, we grant it: But if he intends it poſitively, that the *Maſter*'s Faith is enough to Intitle the whole *Family* to Salvation, the Covenant of Grace and Baptiſm, without their perſonal Faith, we abſolutely deny it; and he has not yet proved it, nor indeed is he able to do it.

He goes on, ſtill harping upon the ſame ſtring, and tells us, *page* 38. *That if Mr.* Danvers *could have produced any one Scripture, wherein the Apoſtles did exclude Infants, or in their practice did refuſe to Baptize them, he had ſaid ſomething to his purpoſe.*

'Tis an unpleaſant task to be anſwering to the very ſame thing ſo often; that when this *Proteus* varies his word, but not his ſenſe, to make the Reader believe it is a new Argument, ſhall we be obliged to be as impertinent in replying, as he is in inhauncing the bulk of his Book by ſuch trifling Repetitions? Have we not over and over again, told him, (his own party

ty with open mouth, affirming the same thing) that for *every positive part of Gods Worship, there is need of Scripture-precept, or example to warrant it?* And is not our practice of Baptizing Believers confirmed by both, as all parties confess? Whereas Mr. *Baxter* (and others) own that *Infant-Baptism has no express mention in Scripture, nor in the Records and Histories of the Church.* More proofs, *p.* 279. *&c.*

2. Have we not again and again affirmed, (and which is no other than pure Protestant Doctrine; Witness Dr. *Owen* in his answer to Mr. *Parker*, *page* 345. where he calls what Mr. *W.* here urges a *captious and sophistical Tale, by which ten thousand things may be made lawful.* And a little further saies, *that every thing (esteemed as any part of Divine Worship) is forbidden, that is not commanded.*) That the affirmative Command includes the Negative; and so the command to Baptize Believers, and the constant practice of the Apostolical primitive times to Baptize *only* such, is enough to warrant the exclusion of Infants from that Ordinance; so that the Scripture indeed *excludes* them, in as much as it doth not *include* them: and the command of Baptizing persons upon a *profession of Faith*, excludes such as cannot, or will not make such a profession. But he would have us tell him, *Where or when the Apostles refused to Baptize any?* But it were more proper for him, to give us some instance when any were brought or offered to them to be Baptized, for we read of none refused, because none offered; and certainly had it been the practice to Baptize Infants, we should have some instance of it in some part of the New-Testament. We never yet found in Scripture that the Apostles refused to Baptize the Children of Unbelievers, shall

we therefore conclude they were Baptized. But we read, *Mark* 10. 14. (the Text ſo often produced for Infant-Baptiſm, but a pregnant place againſt it) that the Diſciples *rebuked ſuch as brought Children* to *Chriſt*, which ſurely they would not have done, had it been the practice to Baptize them. Beſides the Text ſaies, *they brought them only to be touched by our Saviour*, and he *bleſt*, *not Baptiz'd them*; and certainly, if any Infants had a right to be Baptized, thoſe Infants had it; for Chriſt ſays, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*; he knew if they were of the Elect, and therefore it would be no Hazard to baptize them, had he allowed it. But this Text indeed informs us, that our Children may be bleſt, and be of the Kingdom of Heaven, by the application of Gods Free Grace without Baptiſm; which is only a *Duty* to ſuch as it is commanded to, *viz.* ſuch as are capable of *Faith* and *Repentance*. But,

3. Will Mr. *Whiſton* indeed adventure to practice any thing that is not litterally and ſyllabicably forbidden in Scripture (not allowing any Negative conſequences?) If ſo, then the *children of Heathens*, or *Turks*, *&c.* being not, in ſo many words, forbidden to be baptized, will give him employment enough. And hundreds of the ridiculous *inventions* of *Romiſh Impoſtors* are not forbidden by name and circumſtance, (being indeed not known any more than Infant-baptiſm in thoſe times:) Will he therefore hold them lawful? and this is the conſequence of his Doctrine, utterly *exploded* by the moſt Orthodox Proteſtants.

He proceeds *page* 40. and would have us believe, *That Infants are capable of the ends and uſes of Baptiſm*, whereof he mentions two: 1. *To ſeal, confirm, and*

and ratifie the Covenant, with the promiſe-thereof, unto thoſe with whom it is eſtabliſh'd. 2. To give thoſe a ſolemn admiſſion into the Viſible Church, who have an antecedent right thereto: and this he takes for granted (which is begging upon begging) concluding, *He will not ſpend time in the proof of that, which no Body can or will deny.*

Now he has made quick work on't; but ſhould not he have known our minds before ſo confident a publication of our aſſent to his Dictate?

And ſince that's all, we do here publickly enter our *diſſent*; and lay down this as our belief; That Infants (till they grow up and are converted) are not capable of the ends and uſes of Baptiſm, which are; to witneſs Repentance and Regeneration already wrought, to repreſent the Death, Burial, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, the waſhing away our ſins by the blood of Chriſt, our union with, and putting on Chriſt, our entrance into, and right to partake of all the priviledges in the Viſible Church. And as to what Mr. *Whiſton* ſays, ſince he only beggs, *That the Covenant and Promiſes are eſtabliſh'd with Infants, and therefore have an Antecedent right to Church membership*; We reject it, as unproved, and un-ſcriptural. And he is at liberty to make good his, and diſprove our aſſertion if he can: Which I ſhall expect, *ad Calendas Græcas.*

He tells us, *page* 46. *That* John *did not diſcharge the* Jews *from any priviledg they afore had, only rectifies a miſtake they lay under.*

Here he had done honeſtly if he had acquainted us what their miſtake was, ſince he knows *John's* mind ſo well: but alas, he fore-ſaw that that would ſpoil his aim; therefore that the Reader may not be at a

loſs altogether, I have Tranſcribed it from Dr. *Owen's Exercit* before-mentioned; and I dare ſay, the Doctor knows their miſtake as well as our Anſwerer; he (I mean the Doctor) calls it a woful and fatal miſtake, *page* 55, 56. For they would entail Goſpel-priviledges upon the old Fæderal right, and would ſhare of the bleſſings belonging only to Believers, upon the carnal conſideration of being *Abrahams* natural Poſterity; *They thought* (ſaies this Judicious Divine) *no more was needful to intereſt them in the Covenant of* Abraham, *but that they were* Abraham's *Seed according to the fleſh, pleading the later priviledg as the ground of the former: But on that account they could have no other priviledg then* Abraham *had in the fleſh himſelf*, viz. *that God would derive the promiſed Seed* (the Meſſiah) *through his Loins into the World.* And is not this to a tittle, the miſtake of our *Pædo-baptiſts*, who plead for Infant-baptiſm from the very ſame ground of the *Birth priviledg*, and entailing Church-Ordinances upon the ſame *Fæderal Right* they did?

I cannot but note an expreſſion he hath, *page.* 38. *viz. Becauſe we know not the time when Infant-baptiſm was inſtituted, we may therefore ſay it is* from Heaven, and not of men.

Now *I* perceive the reaſon why he beſtows ſo glorious a Title upon his Book. But ſhall we conclude that the Tares the Enemy ſowed, while the Watchmen ſlept, were *from Heaven, and not of men*, ſince the drouſie Watch-men cannot calculate the time they were ſown to a minute? Learned *Uſher* gives *Malone* the Jeſuite an anſwer to this purpoſe, when he maintained, that the Maſs was of Divine inſtitution, becauſe Proteſtants could not exactly find o[ut]

its

its Nativity, or when the fooleries that attend it, had their Original. Muſt we receive every error, when we cannot aſſign the critical minute of its broaching? Suppoſe *I* know not the time when Mr. *Whiſton* was born, ſhall *I* therefore conclude him not to be a man, nor of *men*, but dropt *from Heaven*, *&c?* Is it not enough, if we can tell the time when Infant-baptiſm was not in the Church? and that Mr. *Baxter* has (very kindly) done for us, when he ſaies, *that it has no expreſs mention in the Records or Hiſtories of the Church*, for the *firſt* (and pureſt) *Centuries*. And if this be the ground of his mock-title, *I* ſhall conclude it to be (like Mr. *B.* plain Scripture-proof) of a complexion that cannot bluſh.

As to what he ſaith about Tradition, being nothing of weight, and upon which he leans not much, *I* ſhall paſs it by, only note that Dr. *Owen* defines *Tradition*, *pag.* 20. *Exercit.* on the *Heb. Tom.* 1. to be *a general uninterrupted Fame conveyed and confirmed by particular Inſtances, Records, and Teſtimonies in all ages. And no other Tradition*, the *Doctor* ſaies, *is of any weight*. And how far ſhort of making out his Infant-ſprinkling, by *Tradition* ſo underſtood this Author hath been, is ſufficiently demonſtrated already. And ſo I proceed.

He ſaith *page* 75. *It is their Covenant-intereſt that we contend for principally, and deſign the proof of from the Covenant at firſt eſtabliſhed with* Abraham; and again, *we plead not for Infant Baptiſm from the Analogy it bears with or to Circumciſion, but from the Command obliging* Abraham's *Seed in their Generations to keep the token of the Covenant.*

This is ſomewhat odd, *he pleads not for Circumciſion, but from the token of the Covenant*, which in ano-

ther place he calls *Circumciſion*; which is in plain Engliſh that he pleads, and pleads not, from *Circumciſion*: So that I know not how to come at him. This is a new way of diſtinction, to diſtinguiſh *Circumciſion* from *Circumciſion*; he would ſeem to leave that baffled *argument* of ſome of the *Ancients*, and yet he cannot but be at it again.

We acknowledg there was a Command obliging *Abraham*'s Seed in their Generations to be Circumciſed, (which he means by the token of the Covenant,) but that adminiſtration came to its period at the coming of *Chriſt*; and therefore the command of being Circumciſed is not in force now. Nor have we any new Command that Believers and their Seed muſt be baptized in their Generations; beſides the term *Generations* is frequently uſed to ſignifie a certain and limited time, *the burning of the Kidnies*, and the *burning of the Fat of Beaſts* to be Sacrificed, is ſaid to be *a perpetual Statute in their Generations*, *Lev.* 3.17. So the *Offerings made by fire*, Lev. 6. 18. *The Feaſt of Booths*. Lev. 23. 41. which nevertheleſs have their period with the Law. So where God promiſes to be a God to *Abraham* and his carnal Seed in their *Generations*, it is meant during the *Legal adminiſtration*; not but that if *Abraham* be underſtood as a *Spiritual Father*, *God* will be a *God* to him, and his Seed, *viz.* (ſuch as did believe as he did) without limitation, *for ever*. Whereas if he be underſtood as a *Political* and *Natural* Parent, the Covenant then muſt needs be underſtood (to make any thing for them) abſolute and everlaſting; but that were abſurd, for the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, *viz.* the Unbelieving *Jews* have broke the Covenant, and are now cut off, which they could not have been, if that Poſition were true.

But

But that the Covenant was not abſolute (as it reſpected the Temporal ot Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*,) I evince thus: If (while the Church of the *Jews* was in being) God denies *himſelf to be their God, and diſowns them as his people, becauſe of their tranſgreſſion*, then the promiſe was *Conditional*, not abſolute, but the Antecedent is true, *Hoſ.* 1.9. *Exod.* 19.5,6. *Jer.* 23.14.

But if you lay ſo much ſtreſs upon that expreſſion, that God ſhould be a God to you and your Seed, what account will it amount unto? for you can apply nothing of the Promiſe to them, but the bare outward act of Baptizing (or rather Rantizing?) but what of favour or Spiritual ſaving-mercy is that? or what advantage is it? ſince the Children that dye Unbaptized, are as capable of Salvation, as thoſe you Baptize. For it is the Proteſtant Doctrine, not to aſcribe Salvation *Opere operato*, and therefore Baptiſm confers not Grace, nor Saves the dying Soul, unleſs in conjunction with *Faith*, which applies the *blood* of Chriſt.

The Covenant made to *Abraham* and his Spiritual Seed, reſpects *Salvable* Mercies, Grace here, and Glory hereafter; but Baptiſm of Infants can confer neither, therefore it is not the Covenant made with *Abraham*.

Nor need we yield to that Opinion that would force us to acknowledg no Covenant but what is mutual, becauſe this Covenant conſiſts of Free Donation, and ſo rather a Teſtament than Covenant, as *Ames Mar.* Divinity, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 23. affirms. And the word ברית is Tranſlated διαθήκην in this place by the 70; and in all places of the Old Teſtament, except *Iſai.* 28.15. where they render it συνθήκην *fœdus vel pactum*

pactum inter partes, a Covenant betwixt parties, as *Leigh* in his *Critica ſacra*. And that Διαθήκη is Engliſht a Teſtament, ſee *Matth.* 26. 28. *Mark* 14.14. *Heb.* 9.15,17. 1 *Cor.* 11.25. *Luke* 22. 20. So that the propereſt expreſſion is, to call it the *Teſtament of Grace*; and this *name* is moſt agreeable to the *nature* of the thing, for God doth hereby diſpoſe, convey, and beſtow all that *Grace* which may fit all his *Heirs* for his *Eternal* Glory.

By vertue of this Teſtament, or Covenant of Grace was the Land of *Canaan* promiſed to *Abraham* for his *Natural* Poſterity; which Typified the Heavenly *Canaan*, which his *Spiritual* Seed ſhould enjoy, upon the exhibition of the *Meſſiah*; and which is indeed the chief Bleſſing: Not but that ſome of his natural Seed too ſhould enjoy the later, provided they be his Spiritual Seed by Faith, as well as his Natural Seed by Generation: See *Jer.* 32. 40. *Heb.* 8. 8,9,10,11,12. and 10. 16,17. *Jer.* 31. 23. and that ſame condition of Faith is ſtill required of the Seed of Believers, and without it they have no intereſt in Chriſtian Ordinances; which Mr. *W.* takes no notice of, but concludes in contradiction to what he ſaid before, *That as* Abraham *and his Seed were Circumciſed, Believers and their Seed muſt be Baptized*; the main thing in doubt betwixt us, and for which he offers no proof.

But he goes on *page* 77. *If the Covenant Believers are now under, be the ſame with that eſtabliſht with* Abraham *and his Seed, and that as ſuch: that Circumciſion was the ſign, token, or ſeal of the Covenant, and Baptiſm doth now ſucceed in the place, room, and uſe of Circumciſion; then Infants ought to be Baptized, as of old they were Circumciſed*: (obſerve his frequent contradi-

traditions, just now he renounced what here he concludes: *But if these, or any of these things be not so, but are meer mistakes on our parts, I must confess we have no sure footing for Infant-Baptism in the Covenant, as at first established with* Abraham *and his Seed in their Generation.*

This is indeed the grand *Fabrick* whereby Infant-Baptism has been of late Years supported; which if we can demolish, the *Super structure* must needs fall, as now ingeniously acknowledged. Nor need we employ any greater strength against it, then what Dr. *Owen* lends us, *Exercit. 6. page 55. &c.* quoted before: where he solidly confutes the Plea from the *Birth-priviledg*, to Christian Ordinances. And therefore to produce Dr. *Owen* against Mr. *Whiston*, is a sufficient Confutation, if we had said no more. And this being the Radical *Thesis*, to which the other Considerations, he wastes his paper and time about, are only subservient as Attendants, (that the number and equipage of the retinue might bespeak its *grandeur* and port.) If we should take no notice of any thing he saies further, but apply our Arguments only to that, it were enough, since if this be once conmted, the rest of his Book is cashier'd of course.

Which piece of Service the *Doctor* has excellently done to our hands, proving undeniably that *Abraham* has but two Seeds, the *natural Jew*, and actual *professing Believers*; and that such only as are Heirs of *Abraham*'s Faith, have right to *Gospel priviledges*, the old *Fœderal* right being insufficient to entitle the *Jews* thereto; therefore let Mr. *Whiston* either convince the *Doctor* if this be an error, or be convinced by him, in case it be a truth: Or let him reconcile that *Exercitation* to the practice of Baptizing Infants upon a *Fœderal*

deral Right, or tell us plainly, in what third capacity the Infant-seed of Believers now are the children of *Abraham*, since they are not his natural Seed (as all must own) nor (as the Doctor well words it in the case of the *Jews*) can they, wanting personal Faith, be counted his Spiritual Seed?

But however a little to examine this foundation-principle, three Things are to be offered to our Enquiry: 1. *Whether the Covenant Believers are now under, be the same established with* Abraham *and his Seed.* 2. *Whether Circumcision be the sign, token, or seal of that Covenant.* 3. *Whether Baptism doth succeed in the place, use, and room of Circumcision.*

To the first I say as before, that the Covenant must be considered in a two-fold respect; 1. In respect to *Spiritual* Blessings, *Grace* here, and *Glory* hereafter; so it is and was the same to *Abraham*'s Spiritual Seed in and through all Generations from him to us, *viz.* such as Believed as he did. 2. In respect to Temporal blessings, and so it was peculiar to his Natural and Spiritual Seed, during the Old-Testament-dispensation, and Typical administrations; and in that respect it is not the same, Believers being now under the former, not the later.

As *Abraham* is considered under the notion of a double *Father-hood*, so there must be a double *Son-ship* to answer that Relation; the *Jews* were his Sons in one capacity, namely a Carnal Generation, of which they were wont to bragg, as appears by the reproof *John* gave them, *Mat.* 3. 9. *Think not to say within your selves, we have* Abraham *to our Father*; and in the other capacity all Believers, whether *Jew* or *Gentile* are his *children*: This is evidenced *Rom.* 9. 6,7,8. *They are not all* Israel *that are of* Israel; *they which*

which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, &c. and *v.* 7. shews us, that their Carnal Generation gives not the true notion of *Sonship.*

The *Jew* as a Natural Son of *Abraham* may pretend to Baptism, and New-Testament-Ordinances by a *priority* in respect of the *Offer*, *Rom.* 3. 1, 2. Therefore Christ commanded his *Apostles*, not to go into the wayes of the *Gentiles, &c.* but *to the lost sheep of the House of* Israel, and Preach the Gospel to them, *Mat.* 10. 5, 6, 7. See *Rom.* 2. 10. *to the* Jew *first, and also to the* Gentile; and this gave occasion to the Speech of *Peter*, *Acts* 2. 39. *The promise is to you and your Children*, viz. primarily; and to the *Gentiles* also but secondarily, which they of the *Circumcision were astonisht at*, *Acts* 10. 45. The *Gentiles* are called *afar off*, suitable to *Eph.* 2. 13. *Ye* (Gentiles) *who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ.* Now as it was the preheminence of the *Jews* to have the Gospel first Preached to them, so we find their carnal prerogative stand them in no stead, *Luke* 3. 8. where they are informed that Gospel-Ordinances are not bottom'd upon Carnal Generation, or priviledges; but true Holiness manifested by the fruit it brings forth, *viz.* Fruits meet for Repentance: *He came to his own, but they received him not*; and therefore *as many as received him*, whether Jew or Gentile, *to them he gave power to become the Sons of God*; and to receive him, is to *believe in his Name.*

Men are now admitted to Ordinances upon other considerations than legal denominations of clean or unclean, *viz.* fearing God, and working righteousness, which is not generated or *conveyed* by Birth, but by the New birth, and the *Spirit* of the living God.

There-

Therefore if the Natural Seed of *Abraham* could not pretend a right to New-Teſtament Ordinances by that Title, much leſs the Adopted Seed, by any ſuch way of Natural Generation. And if their Birth-right could not ſerve them, how can our Birth-right ſerve us?

And this may ſerve as an Anſwer to the firſt particular; that the Covenant as it reſpected Life and Salvation to Believers, is one and the ſame now as then. But as it reſpects external adminiſtrations, and the qualification of Church-members it is not the ſame; the legal, typical, fœderal right vaniſht, and *Faith* is now the only qualification.

The ſecond, *Whether Circumciſion be the token, ſign, or ſeal of the Covennnt?* This needs but a ſhort Reply, for we find it to be called *the token of the Covenant*, *Gen.* 17. 11. And the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 4. 11. *calls it the ſign of Circumciſion, a Seal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, &c.* intimating by diſtinguiſhing between a *Sign* and a *Seal*, that Circumciſion was to all a *Sign*, but to *Abraham* alone a Seal of the righteouſneſs of Faith. And we find Circumciſion never called a Seal, but where it ſpeaks of *Abraham*, which intimates that it was only a Seal to him. And this is ſutable to what *Chryſoſtome*, *Theophilact*, and others (quoted upon the place by a very judicious pen) *viz. It was called a Seal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, becauſe it was given to* Abraham *as a Seal and teſtimony of that righteouſneſs which he had acquired by Faith: Now this ſeems to be the priviledg of* Abraham *alone, and not to be transferred to others, as if Circumciſion, in whom ever it was, were a teſtimony of Divine righteouſneſs: for as it was the priviledg of* Abraham, *that he ſhould be the father of all the faithful, as well circumciſed, as uncircumci-*

circumcised, and being already the father of all uncircumcised, having faith in uncircumcision, he received first the sign of Circumcision, that he might be the father of the Circumcised. Now because he had this priviledg in respect of the righteousness which he had acquired by faith, therefore the sign of Circumcision was to him a Seal of the righteousness of Faith, *but to the rest of the* Jews it was a Sign they were *Abraham's* Seed, but not a Seal of the righteousness of Faith; *i.* all the *Jews* also were not the Fathers of many *Nations*. And *Jerom* upon *Gal.* 3. saith, *Because Christ was to spring from the Seed of* Abraham, *and many Ages were to pass from* Abraham *to Christ, the wise God, lest the Seed of beloved* Abraham *should be mingled with other Nations, and should by degrees be joyned more familiarly, distinguisht the flock of* Israel *by a certain mark or Circumcision; then for* 40 *Years together in the wilderness none were Circumcised, because they were out of the danger of such mixtures, being alone; but as soon as they were past the banks of* Jordan, *Circumcision prevented the error of mingling with others; whereas it is written that they were Circumcised that second time by* Joshua, *it signifies that Circumcision ceased in the Wilderness, which was rationally used in* Egypt.

3. *Whether Baptism doth succeed in the room, place, and use of Circumcision?*

To answer this doubt, let us consider the great *difference* between Circumcision, and Baptism. Circumcision was a *legal* Ordinance appointed to the Jewish Males Reprobate as well as Elect, by a positive command to distinguish them from the rest of the World, as a Token of the Covenant God made with *Abraham, viz.* that the *Messiah* should come of his Loins according to the Flesh. But

Baptism

Baptiſm is an *Evangelical* Ordinance, whereby Jew or Gentile, Male or Female, upon a profeſſion of Faith and Repentance is baptized in Water, in token of Regeneration, and to ſignifie the *death*, *burial*, and *reſurrection* of Chriſt, the *Meſſiah* already come, and ſo added to the Viſible Church, and admitted to all the priviledges thereof; which being not the Office of Circumciſion, Baptiſm cannot be ſaid to ſucceed in its room, place, and uſe.

The conſideration of the great difference in their inſtitution illuſtrates this alſo; for when Chriſt inſtituted Baptiſm, he ſaies, *Go teach, and baptize*; and in the adminiſtration, *they confeſſed and were baptized*, *Believed and were Baptized*; not a word of Infants. And in the Precept of Circumciſion, not a word of *Teaching*, or *Faith*; but of Infants the command expreſly notes the *time*, *age*, and *ſex*. The Levitical and Typical Holineſs in *Abrahams* Houſhold, whether natural or adopted, included not Regeneration, nor heart-cleanneſs, which is our holineſs; land, fruit, and trees were holy, in a typical conſideration, when Circumciſion was predicated of *Trees* as well as *Men*, *Lev.* 9. 23. And for us to affirm that Trees ought to be now baptized as they were then reputed to be Circumciſed, is a wild way of reaſoning.

And therefore ſince things become Ordinances to us by vertue of a word of inſtitution, and no ſuch word is found to make out that Baptiſm ſucceeds Circumciſion in its room, place, and uſe, we think it ſafe to be ſober, and advance no further than the Scripture guides. And to make Circumciſion inſtitutive of Baptiſm, is to ſend us to School to the Law, and that *Old firſt vaniſhing Covenant*, as it is ſtiled, *Heb.* 8. as if the Law-giver in the *New-Teſtament* had not,

not by a positive institution establisht his Ordinances there, nor left us any Warrant for our Gospel-Duties, without that retrogression to *Moses*, and assimilating them to the Pædagogy and similitude of Types.

So that these things being found meer mistakes on Mr. *Whiston*'s side, we may conclude (in his own words,*that they have no sure footing in the Covenant for the baptizing of Infants.*

He saith, *page* 81. *The Covenant Gen.* 17.7. *was made with* Abraham *in both capacities*, viz. *as a Natural, and Spiritual Father.* What then? This is a meer *Ignoratio Elenchi*, and Mr. *W.* has a peculiar Talent to prove that which is not deny'd. But to this I have spoke before.

He argues, *page* 89. thus: *If* Jacob *and* Esau *in their Infant-state, were heirs of the World, through the righteousness of Faith, when they had no personal faith, then the Infant-seed of Believers may be so too.* But —— *Ergo* —— the Text he grounds upon is *Heb.* 11. 9. *dwelling in Tabernacles with* Isaac *and* Jacob, *heirs with him of the same Promise.*

The vanity of which consequence will appear, if you consider,

1. That there is nothing in that Text to countenance his assertion: We grant *Isaac* and *Jacob* were heirs of the same Promise, as well in respect of Gods Covenant with their Father *Abraham* and his Seed, as their own personal faith, when they came to years; but that it should follow, that all the Carnal Seed of Believers should be so too, is that that needs proof, and we deny.

2. I humbly conceive, That to be heirs of the world through the righteousness of faith, and yet have

have no personal faith, as he words it, is meer contradiction and non-sense.

3. The promise to which *Isaac* and *Jacob* were heirs, is, That the *Messiah* should come of their Loins, according to the Flesh, and how that (being already fulfilled) can be applicable to the children of believers, I cannot tell, nor Mr. *Whiston* neither: Therefore his Syllogism is vain and empty.

He proceeds *pag.* 93. To demand, *Whether there be any Original Sin? If so, how came any Infants to be saved, unless through the righteousness of faith?* viz. *Gods non imputation of guilt to them*, &c. *Now*, says he, *if they are capable of the righteousness of faith, why may they not have that righteousness sealed to them by an outward and visible sign?*

To wave many things that may be said to shew the childishness of the *Quære*, we say, The same reason may be urged for *Unbelievers* children; for if they be capable of the *grace* and *mercy* of *Christ*, in order to their salvation, *viz. non imputing sin, and imputing the righteousness of Christ to them as well as the children of Believers*; then (at your rate of reasoning) they have as good right to the outward visible Sign. If you deny the former, you impeach the free grace of Christ, and have little of Christian Charity. If you grant it, your Position's overthrown.

In *pag.* 101. he tells us (if we'll believe him) *That Circumcision was administred to the Adult, considered as believers.*

Here I confess, I do not understand, what he means by Believers. I thought the term [*Believer*] had not been used to have been appropriated to any person, but in respect to *Christ*; viz. Such as had some knowledge of, and believed in, the *Messiah* to come,

or

or already come: Otherwiſe ſuch of the *Ethnicks*, who believe a *Deity*, but not a *Redeemer*; muſt needs be ſaved. I am ſure the *Jews* are accounted *Unbelievers* to this day, becauſe they *reject* Chriſt, which could not be, if their admiſſion to *Circumciſion* and to be Members of the *Commonwealth* and the *Church of Old*, had been upon the account of faith. So that there is no truth in this poſition; for it doth not appear that the Proſelytes, or any others, were informed of the *Meſſiah*, before they were circumciſed; or that they gave any teſtimony of their belief in him: but only that they *owned* the *God* of *Iſrael to be the true God*, and were willing to be joyned to that *Common-wealth*. And Mr. *W.* knows, that that is not ſufficient now, there muſt be faith in Chriſt, elſe no believer.

But what would he conclude from hence? Suppoſe the Adult that were circumciſed, were conſidered as Believers; if he ſay, So all the Adult that are baptized, are to be ſo conſidered (which is the moſt natural inference that can be drawn hence) we are agreed.

But I perceive the *pains* he takes here, is to make way for that abſurd *Poſition* he is now coming to (and which I conceive he is the *Protoplaſt* of) *pag.* 116. *That Circumciſion was adminiſtred to the Jewiſh infants, conſidered as the ſeed of Believers.* By the way, I wonder the man will trouble himſelf ſo much about Circumciſion, when he profeſſes ſo gravely, *pag.* 75. *That he pleads not for Baptiſm from any Analogy with it.* Which would make one ſuſpect, that he is apt to forget himſelf, or that he thinks we'll believe any thing; ſo ſoon as he pronounces his Magiſterial, *Thus I ſay it*, &c. But let's hear how he proves

it; *Why* (says he) *because the Adult that were circumcised, were considered as the seed of Believers.* A worthy proof indeed, but 'tis all we are like to have. He takes it for granted (it seems) that the Adult were circumcised as Believers, and grounds his Argument upon it as his *Medium.* But Logicians will tell him, that such a way of Argumentation is but a silly *Petitio Principii*; or *begging the question.* But in order to a further and more particular satisfaction I offer these Considerations.

1. That the Congregrative *Body* of the People, or Jewish Males, were Circumcised in their Infancy; pursuant to the Command of God, being else to be cut off from his people, *Gen.* 17. 14. and therefore this Argument being grounded upon a false *Hypothesis* will vanish. Besides it is a *non-sequitur*: for will it follow, That if the Adult were circumcised upon their own faith (which is but begg'd too) therefore Infants were circumcised upon the faith of others?

2. All that the Scripture mentions to be circumcised at Age, are, 1. Those that were *at years* at its first Institution. 2. The *Proselytes* that were made from time to time. 3. The Jews in *Joshuah*'s time circumcised after 40 years discontinuance of it in the *Wilderness.*

Now as to the first, We find no other qualification required, to entitle them to Circumcision, but to be *Jews*, or *Abraham*'s natural Seed; nor any mention made, that Belief was a condition *sine qua non*; nor any excluded for want of it. Yea *Ishmael* was Circumcised though not in the Covenant, when 13 years of age, for God said, *verse* 21. *My Covenant will I establish with* Isaac; which phrase is brought by

by an *Antitheſis* to *Iſhmael*, excluding him, though born of *Abrahams* body: and we find the numerous Family of *Abraham* circumciſed immediately, without any examination of their Faith. And whether Mr. *Whiſton* or the *Scripture* be to be the ſooner believed, is eaſie to be determined.

2. As to *Proſelites*, he ſays he remembers not any particular inſtance of any ſuch that were circumciſed; but concludes *ſome were Circumciſed, and that as Believers, becauſe they kept the Paſſeover to the Lord, Exod.* 12. 48. which indeed proves that ſtrangers, when Circumciſed, may keep the Paſſeover; but not any thing to his purpoſe. For if all that kept the Paſſeover be Believers, how come the Jews that kept (and do ſtill keep) it, to be rejected by Chriſts Law for their Unbelief? Or is the Faith he pleads they had, ſome other Faith, not ſufficient in *Goſpel*-dayes? if ſo, then that Faith that's inſufficient for their admiſſion to Chriſt, is not ſufficient to intitle them to Goſpel-*Ordinances* ordained by *Chriſt*. But what do's Mr. *Whiſton* think of the 10 *Tribes* in *Jeroboam*'s dayes, when they fell to Idolatry, and Worſhipped the *Calves* for 200 Years? Were there no *Proſelytes* all that time? if ſo, were they (when Circumciſed) conſidered as *Believers?* Or were the *Sechemites* (after the Rape of *Dinah*) Believers when Circumciſed, *Gen.* 34? Were the Servants bought with money Believers? or thoſe *Proſelytes* the *Phariſes* compaſſed Sea and Land to gain? Chriſt ſays, *they made them two fold more the Children of Hell.* But this is a fine new Toy, and let Mr. *W.* take the credit of its firſt promulgation.

3. Thoſe that were Circumciſed in *Joſhua*'s time, 5 *chap.* of whoſe Faith we find no Enquiry; they

Were Circumciſed, becauſe God commanded them ſo to be; and if they were to be excluded upon the want of Faith, 'tis certain that among ſuch a multitude, there were many Unbelievers. We read of an *Achan* in the 7 *chap.* that was ſtoned, and the 36. that were ſmitten at *Ai* for the accurſed thing, though Circumciſed a little before; and numbers of them fell in Rebellion againſt the Lord afterwards. So that upon the whole, the Scripture tells us of no qualification that intitled to Circumciſion, ſave to be a natural Jew, or ſuch as were Proſelyted, or bought with money: And to invent others is point blank arrogance.

So that our concluſion is firm, *viz.* that to be the fleſhly Seed of a Jew, or bought with his money, was enough to qualifie for Circumciſion; no profeſſion of Faith being pre-required of either, *Gen.* 17. 12. *And he that is eight dayes old ſhall be Circumciſed, &c.* not he that believes, or is a Believers Child, *&c.* And what advantage the extravagant round-abouts (in which Mr. *Whiſton* ſo abounds) has got him, I cannot yet perceive. I am ſure it convinces me that he is in extream poverty of argument, when he is forced to have recourſe to ſuch Forreign and Remote Projects to uphold his tottering cauſe.

As to the trouble he is in about the promiſes made to *Abraham*, *Whether they belong to the Covenant of works, nature, or grace, or no Covenant at all*, concluding thus; *If our Author will help us out here, he ſhall have hearty thanks for his pains.*

To which I ſay, that I doubt Mr. *W.* diſſembles egregiouſly, for I cannot conjecture how he can be ſo ignorant. But the perplexity he involves himſelf in, is a needleſs impertinent one; and whoever goes to

pluck

pluck him out, is as idle as himſelf. But yet if he be really at a loſs, and to deſerve his thanks (if it be not a *complement*) I ſhall adventure to direct him, where he may learn what the promiſe made to *Abraham* was, and how to be underſtood in relation to both Natural and Spiritual Seed. Let him turn to Dr. *Owen*'s, 6 *Exercit.* on the *Hebrews*, *page* 55,56. *&c.* where he will be informed, the Doctor exactly agreeing with us, and fully ſpeaking our ſenſe in that point, and therefore quoted by me at large in my *Treatiſe*. And I hope Mr. *Whiſton* cannot ſuſpect the partiality of the Informer.

And for his interpretation of *Gal.* 3. 29. Ει δε ὑμεις χριστου, *if ye be of Chriſt*; or *appertain to Chriſt*, were it admitted, it is no diſadvantage to us, it being the ſame in ſenſe with our Vulgar Tranſlations: And if Believers Children, as he ſays, be of Chriſt, it muſt be in reſpect of *Calling*, or *Election*, the former is not to be alledged; and the later may be true for ought we know, but that's no ground for any Goſpel-adminiſtrations which are diſpenſable only according to appearance; and ſince no Faith or Signs of Election appears, and that *de non apparentibus, & de non exiſtentibus eadem eſt ratio*, we, according to Scripture-warrant and example, ſuſpend our Baptizing them, till they can give ſome evidence of their right to it; and if a ſuppoſing them to be Elect be a good ground to baptize, then the children of Unbelievers have a good plea, becauſe ſome of them are *Elect*.

As to what he offers in order to remove the abſurdities charged by Mr. *Danver*'s upon the practice of baptizing Infants, and his eſſay to vindicate the practice of Sprinkling for Dipping, they are fully and clearly, as to the ſubſtance of them, already ſo blaſted

by Mr. *D.* himſelf, that I ſhall paſs them; and ſhall only conclude that conſideration with the words of *Dr. Martin Luther* in his Book *de Baptiſmo Tom.* 1. *p.* 71,72. ſpeaking of the ſignification of the word, *Baptizmus Græcum eſt, latine poteſt verti merſio, cum immergimus aliquid in Aqua, ut totum tegatur Aqua. Et quamvis ille mos jam aboleverit, apud pleroſq; debebant tamen prorſus immergi, & ſtatim retrahi. —— Et ſane ſi ſpectes quid Baptiſmus ſignificet, idem requiri videbis*; that is, *Baptiſm is a Greek word, and may be interpreted an Over-whelming, when we plunge any thing into the Water, that it may be covered all over. And although that cuſtome is now out of uſe with many, yet they ought truly to be dipt, and preſently lifted up again. And certainly if you conſider the nature of the thing, you will ſee that to be neceſſary*; which being the true ſignification of the word, we find cauſe rather to adhere to it, than follow Mr. *Whiſton*'s unſcriptural Dictates.

As to what he cloſes withall, that *our practice of Dipping is a breach of the Sixth and Seventh Commandements.* Let the ſame return ſerve his impious inſinuation, as is given to Mr. *B.* and Mr. *W.* after whoſe Copies he writes.

And ſo I ſhall conclude with an admonition to Mr. *Whiſton* to more Chriſtian moderation; and if he thinks himſelf concerned to appear farther in ths *Controverſie*, that he lay aſide all *paſſion* and *heat*, as inconſiſtent with a Goſpel-frame of Spirit, and tending to the extirpation of that Charity and Mutual Forbearance our Lord Jeſus expects from us. And let him lay down his *Theſis* diſtinctly, and ſet down his Arguments ſyllogiſtically, or in a form more intelligible to all perſons, which he will; and directly to the

matter

matter in debate: and not to trouble us, nor the world with extraneous and needleſs rambles, leaving the Cardinal pretence uneſſay'd: (as he hath done) ſave at a very great diſtance, and with ſuch timorouſneſs and collateral approaches, as would make one think he has no great confidence in the attempt, however he would carry it in tongue, and confidence. And I can aſſure him, that if there be any eſcape or undue reflection in what I have offered, which may tend to the breach of Peace or Charity, I allow not my ſelf in it, and will be willing to receive an admonition if offered in meekneſs.

I would further adverti ſe Mr. *Whiſton* not to make Mr. *Baxter*, nor Mr. *Ws.* his pattern in dealing with us, whoſe pens run at ſo licentious a rate, that the moſt unſpotted innocence is not armor enough againſt their virulence. As for the firſt, no pencil can pourtray him better than his *own pen*: A man of quarrel, ſometimes friend, and ſometimes foe, to moſt perſwaſions; to reject whoſe poyſon is to provoke his ſting; And to ſlight his Dictates, how incongruous ſoever to truth, and inconſiſtent among themſelves, is to undergo the ſevere Diſcipline of his laſhing pen. Man-kind (it ſeems) muſt gape for his Oraculous Dictates, and muſt believe him as his preſent Sentiments actuate him, or elſe take what comes after.

Nor need we expreſs Mr. *Ws.* in a more averting Character than that he ſquires after him; and ſhould we apeal to Mr. *Whiſton*, or any ſober man of his perſwaſion, we doubt not but we may have ſo much equity as to diſallow his late dealing with us. Figuring and Traducing us in his invective reflections upon the perſon of Collonel *Danvers*, as if we had been ſuch dangerous perſons, *&c.* in theſe phraſes, — *When*

their hands are tyed from fighting, — Exploits done in the time of his Collonelship, — &c. And what is that but to exaſperate the world againſt us, and expoſe us to the frowns of Authority as much as he can? how does this poyſonous inſinuation conſiſt with his pretences of reſpect? This looks like *Juda*'s kiſs. Would he think it fair if we ſhould uſe the engine of Repercuſſion here? doth it not rather (in his own Oratory) diſcover the ebullition of a temporizing, waſpiſh ſpirit? *But he loves us Brethren, and deſires not our ſhame.*] He is as courteous as lightning, that ſpares the Scabbard, but deſtroys the blade. After he has repreſented us as ſuch miſhapen *Bug bears*, and wounded us with his keeneſt Railery, he would lick over the place he bit, and make us believe it is all ſtark love and kindneſs. Well, he hath ſhot his Bolt, tells us, *our Doctrine is ominous, not fit for any Age of the Church, with* a fixation of *black characters upon it, leading to blaſphemy, and immorality*; and yet all this, is not to deſire our ſhame. He may by the ſame artifice knock a man down, and laugh upon him, and tell him, he does him good ſervice. He muſt pardon us if we be coy, to ſo rude a kind of Courtſhip.

Therefore upon the whole, if Mr. *Whiſton* perſeveres in that Intemperate angry frame he began withall, in Imitation of the other two, I ſhall not think my ſelf obliged to divert my ſelf from more grateful ſtudies to vye tongue with him; knowing that whatever he ſays, or what hard meaſure he may give me, Truth will remain always anſwerleſs and unconquered.

FINIS.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE READER.

Courteous Reader,

IT is now humbly ſubmitted to thine impartial judgment, Whether our practice of Baptizing Believers ſo fully made out by the Scriptures, the Suffrage of Learned men in every Age of the Church ſince Chriſt, owned by our Severeſt Adverſaries to be a Scriptural Baptiſm, exemplified by the practice of all Antiquity, deſerves ſuch ſharp Rebukes as our preſent Opponents diſpence to us? And whether that cauſe we maintain, though under ſo ſacred a Patronage, deſerves to be ſo perſecuted, as it is by them, and delineated in ſuch frightful Characters? ſince on all ſides the baptizing of the Adult is granted? but Infant-baptiſm by one ſide only, and upon ſuch uncertain grounds too, every diſtinction or denomination of Pædo-baptiſts, adminiſtring it upon a different pretence, ſome upon a miſtake, that it takes away ſin, and ſaves the Child's Soul; ſome affirming the Infant to have Faith; ſome upon the Parents, ſome upon the Pro-parents, or Goſſip's, ſome upon Abraham's, ſome upon the Churches Faith: a very uncertain ſound! whilſt oppoſed on the other ſide with ſuch a dint of Reaſon both from Scripture-Authority, and primitive Antiquity.

And

And ſuppoſe you had been called to decide a matter in controverſie betwixt two, and find that what one affirms is granted on both ſides, but what the other maintains granted by one only, and rationally oppoſed by the other, would you not judge his cauſe beſt, and moſt ſafe, that's allowed by both? And ſuch is our preſent caſe. A Queen *of* England *demanded of the Proteſtant* Prelates, *whether the Church of* Rome *was a true Church, and if Salvation may be had in it? They anſwered in the affirmative. The* Queen *replies, that ſince both ſides grant, there may be Salvation in the Church of* Rome; *and but one only, that there may be Salvation obtainable in the* Church *of* England; *therefore it was the ſafeſt way to remain on that* ſide *that both agreed Salvation may be had in. And though we plead not for the inference as then applyed, yet it holds well in other caſes. For if one ſhould aſk, whether Adult or Infant-baptiſm be a true Scriptural Baptiſm? both ſides are agreed that Adult baptiſm is ſo, and one ſide only holds Infants baptiſm to be lawful. May not the Queriſt ſafely and certainly conclude, that ſide that hath the ſuffrage of both to be ſafeſt. And therefore we hope upon a ſerious weighing this Conſideration, we may have the Juſtice and Equity of an open Ear, from any denomination of the Chriſtian Religion; and that underſtanding the reaſon of our conſciencious diſſent from the practice of Infant-baptiſm, they would not condemn us for affirming what the Scripture invincibly makes out, the ſuffrage of Antiquity ratifies, and they themſelves own.* Farewell.

A BUCKET of WATER
To Quench the FIRE:

Or a Letter to Mr. *Obed. Will*'s concerning the Contention between Him and Mr. *Danvers.*

SIR,

STanders by ſee more than *Gameſters*; and the preſent *heat* and *paſſion* you are in, in your Conteſt with Mr. *Danver*'s hath occaſioned theſe cooling *conſiderations*, and if they may prevail to bring you to your ſelf, I have my end. It's true you have added in the end of your Book, *A perſwaſive to Unity*, and to ſay the truth, you have done excellent well, and have uſed many *Powerful* and *Cogent* Arguments to prevail with Chriſtians to love one another; yea, and you have given us your Opinion of Mr *Danver*'s, that he may be a good man; and that you have a very charitable Opinion of the *Anabaptiſts*. But to ſee you ſpoil all again by your frequent ſcurrilous Reflections, and dirt you caſt upon them in divers places of your Book, as if you would tell the World, that you did not intend any

Unity

Unity with them, or mean as you ſay: But either to keep up an intereſt in the affections of ſome of them, or to quit your ſelf from the Odium of a down-right Railer; therefore you firſt *break* their head, and then give them a *plaiſter*: But do you think they are all Spirit and not Fleſh, that you thus provoke them, and ſtir up the remains of Corruption in them; Did you really intend as You ſay, to be at *Unity* with them, and reduce them to the truth, from which you ſuppoſe they have erred, you would have uſed more moderation. And had you wrote a Letter to Mr. *Danvers* in a Brotherly way, and ſhewed him his miſtakes in ſome of his Collections, and deſired an amicable treatment, how likely would it have been to have produced an *acknowledgment*, and if occaſion had been, a *retractation*. But Mr. *Danvers* has little reaſon to think that you intended his Conviction (as a Brother,) but to defame his perſon, and to diſgrace the whole party, and that you ſought Victory more than Truth, ſo the courſe you take may increaſe the Malady, never heal it; exaſperate, but never unite diſſenters: I could wiſh your diſcourſe of *Unity* had been printed by it ſelf, it might then perhaps have done ſome good, but as joyned to your

your Book, it is a plain contradiction, and not like to produce any advantage, unleſs to diſcover your Hypocriſie.

The character that is given of You (by them that know you) is, that you are a perſon of *a friendly Nature, debonair and courteous* to all, given to *loquacity*, and rather inclin'd to *levity* than *moroſity*; ſo that the Gall and Wormwood in your Book, breeds ſtrange admirations in ſome, and makes them doubt whether it be yours or no. I have heard of a man that beholding a Cat, ſaid, *It's pitty ſo much Cruelty ſhould lodge under ſo mild a countenance.*

But perhaps You'll tell us, there was need of a ſharp reproof, and you thought that the beſt way to convince him; if it were your end (which is much doubted) it has not, nor is it likely to be very ſucceſful. Mr. *Baxter* has been thundring againſt the *Anabaptiſts* theſe twenty Years, (as of late your ſelf and Mr. *Whiſton*) with the greateſt ſeverity, rage, and fury imaginable, loading them with many falſe and unjuſt cenſures, as the *Heathens* uſed the Chriſtian, the *Papiſt* the *Proteſtants*, *they* the *Presbyterians*, and ſo forward: And the name *Heretick* paſſes for Orthodox amongſt you all, but if you did really intend Mr. *Danvers* his conviction,

and

and the good of his Soul; then learn ſome Directions from a late Learned *Author* (one of your own party.)

1. Saith he, *He that reproves another, muſt be careful that himſelf be faultleſs and blameleſs, as much as may be*; The Snuffers of the Sanctuary were of pure Gold: *and it behoves that man that will be a Snuffer to correct others, to be very upright himſelf, and circumſpect in all things; and then he may admoniſh with the greater Authority and Advantage.*

2. *A man muſt be blameleſs in reference to that ſin he reproves eſpecially, elſe in healing his Brother, he doth ſtab himſelf; if thou reproveſt Hereſie, Pride, Prevarication in others, and art guilty thy ſelf, thou doſt but like* David *in* Nathan's *Parable, pronounce the ſentence of thine own Condemnation.*

3. *As he muſt take heed himſelf to be faultleſs, ſo he muſt be ſure his Brother be faulty, for otherwiſe it is not to reprove him, but to reproach him; and inſtead of doing a Chriſtian duty, he commits a Deviliſh ſin, and becomes an Accuſer of the Brethren, inſtead of a reprover of them*; *ſo that the fault muſt not be a conjecture, or imagination, or jealouſie, or rumor*, [and then how Mr. *Baxter* will clear himſelf, I know not.] But Sir, If your Brothers fault muſt not be a conjecture or imagi-

imagination only, how can you and your party ſo reprove the *Anabaptiſts* for Hereſie, Error, *&c.* and ſo majeſtically condemn the whole party, and proudly trample upon all their Arguments, (as if the Word of God had come to you only,) and that there was nothing (as you uſe to ſay) in all their aſſertions; and that all their *Mediums* are ſuch trite and out-worn things that have been trampled upon, and confuted again and again. It ſeems there are others beſides the *Pope* that ſit in *Peters Chair*, & would tell the World they are as infallible as he. But you muſt give us better proof of your *Infallibility* before we believe you, and conclude the *Anabaptiſts* miſtaken in their principles and aſſertions.

4. *He that reproves muſt be ſincere in his ends, and take heed that his aims and intentions be right and honeſt, and that he do not mingle any wild-fire of Pride and vain-glory, and of an ambitious Humor of contradicting and controlling others. This heat muſt be holy heat, a fire of the Sanctuary purely, for Gods Glory, and the Salvation of thy Brothers Soul.*

5. *He muſt reprove Compaſſionately, with the deepeſt ſenſe of his own failings and miſcarriages.* Bernard *ſaid of himſelf, That he*

never

never ſaw another man ſin, but he was diſtruſtful, and jealous of his own Heart, ille heri, tu hodie, & ego cras; he was faulty yeſterday, thou to day, and I may be ſo to morrow.

6. He muſt reprove Charitably, with the greateſt love to mens perſons, even then when he ſhews the greateſt zeal againſt their ſins, for it is one thing to be angry with the *Sins*, another with the *Perſons.* Therefore we ſhould conſult our Brothers credit, and eſteem, and honor, while we ſtab his ſin, and not in healing a wound in his Conſcience or Converſation, to leave a ſcar of reproach upon his perſon, and a brand of ſhame and ignominy upon his Name; that were to do the work of an Enemy under the Vizard of a Friend.

7. *He muſt reprove meekly, not in rage, paſſion, and bitterneſs, but in meekneſs and ſweetneſs of Spirit; This is the Apoſtles rule, Gal.* 6.1. 2 *Tim.* 2.25. Take heed of carrying your *teeth in your tongues*, take ſoft Words to convince Gain-ſayers, and gentle reproofs, and ſolid Reaſons to reduce Offenders. But whether Mr. *Wills* has at all conſulted theſe Rules, (or Mr. *Baxter* before him, and Mr. *Whiſton* ſince,) or whether there has been any thing of tenderneſs to their Opponents names and perſons, any thing

thing of compaſſion, charity, meekneſs, whether any ſerious examination of the abſolute certainty and verity of their own Opinion, leſt themſelves ſhould be miſtaken (as Mr. *Baxter* confeſſes it is eaſie for Wiſe and Good men to be miſtaken in it, the point is ſo dark and dubious) or whether they have enquired into the ſincerity of their ends, whether their heat has been an holy heat, & purely for Gods Glory, and the Salvation of their Brothers Soul: all this is now left at the Bar of the Readers Judgement, and will ſhortly be brought before a greater and more impartial Tribunal. And truly Sir, I muſt tell you, that your dirty Language, your extream ſlighting and contemning your Opponents, loading them with Scandals and Reproaches, ſometimes charging them with ignorance and inſufficiency; proudly and vainly boaſting, and trampling over them in your own conceit, has (not a little) ſpoil'd your cauſe, and given the Anabaptiſts a great advantage againſt you in the Conſciences of ſober and pious Chriſtians. I have heard my ſelf ſome perſons of Quality and Piety to ſay, alas what differerre is there between Mr. *Danvers*, and Mr. *Will's* their Books! the later is ſtuffed with ride, rage, and paſſion, the firſt

with meekneſs, tenderneſs, and humility.

And I ſuppoſe were the Books ſearcht that have been Written of late Years on the ſubject of *Baptiſm*, as Mr. *Baxter*, *Sydenham*, *Cragg*, *Wills*, and *Whiſton*, *&c.* on the one part, and Mr. *Tombes*, *Blackwood*, *Byfield*, *Den*, *Danvers*, *Patient*, *Norcot*, *&c.* on the other part, it would ſeem to be diſcovered by what Spirit they Wrote; and men would ſee in the firſt party a proud, magiſterial, ſcurrilous, abuſive, and ſcornful Spirit; in the other a more humble, gracious, meek, and charitable temper. If any Queſtion it, the Books are Extant, and the matter may ſoon be brought to an iſſue; but Sir, you have out-done them all, not only in ſhooting your invenomed Arrows againſt the whole party, but eſpecially againſt Mr. *Danvers*, as appears by your *Appeal* to the *Baptiſt* Churches againſt him; it ſeems you have arraigned, condemned, and executed him already, and have ſaid implicitely (though audaciouſly) as *Paul* to the Church of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. for though I am abſent in the Body, yet have judged him already, that that he be delivered to Satan.

But ſtay a while Sir, and give Wiſer men leave to ſearch out the matter; Will nothing ſerve your turn but preſent Repentance, or Ex-

Excommunication? What Scripture-rule have you taken to *convince* him? or muſt he *Repent* before any *Conviction* hath paſt upon him? Surely *Illumination* is the firſt work, and the ſame Organ, that is for *Weeping*, is for *Seeing*; but a man muſt ſee firſt, as *Zach.* 12. *They ſhall look, and then mourn.* But Sir, there are as Wiſe men as your ſelf, (and none of his party neither,) that judge that what Mr. *Danver's* has Writ, was in the ſimplicity and ſincerity of his heart, according to his knowledg, and as he apprehended the meaning of thoſe Ancients he has quoted, and that he had no intention to prevaricate (as you charge him with) or abuſe the Fathers, to patronize his Opinion. If otherwiſe, you may think him, *non compos mentis*, conſidering he could not be ignorant of the prejudice and ſedulity of the *Opponents*, who might have advantage enough againſt him, from the *Libraries* in the Univerſities, and elſe-where. It's true indeed ſome of his Friends wiſh he had not concerned himſelf with the Arguments from the Fathers, they ſay, they can ſpare it you very well; & are content with Father *Paul*, Father *Peter*, and the reſt of thoſe Scripture-*Fathers*; what can be drawn from the three Firſt *Centuries*, is rather for than againſt them,

them. And in regard the myſtery of Iniquity began to work in the Apoſtles dayes, and the Apoſtacy ſoon came on, they do not value the following Centuries, though others think the moſt part of his Collections juſtifiable, were the matter brought before impartial and indifferent Judges. And though you have ſo concerned your ſelf, and ſcrued your Wits to maintain Infant-Baptiſm, and ſome of you, as Mr. *B.* and Mr. *Whiſton*, *&c.* by ſuch ſtrange abſurdities, and ridiculous *Mediums*, altogether unknown to the Fathers, yet wiſe men judge, you have been all this while bringing Brick and Mortar towards the repairing of *Babel*, which elſe perhaps would have fallen long ſince; for they do not think, that the more immediate Miniſters and Factors for *Babylon*, would have been able to have brought a ſtone at this day, had not you and others ſtept in, and took the *Anti-chriſtian* party by the hand, and ſaid, *Be ſtrong*; and in this matter, have ſay'd as the Adverſaries of *Judah* and *Benjamin*, *Ezra* 4. 2. *Let us build with you, for we ſeek your God, as ye do*; ſo we Baptize Infants as ye do, and though we differ in ſome Circumſtances, touching the ground of their Baptiſm, yet we all agree in the ſubject, and ſo you have proved the

greateſt

greateſt Enemies to Reformation; though it is ſtrange that men who have Covenanted to reform Religion according to the Word of God, and have pretended to caſt out all the dirt of *Romiſh Superſtitions* and *Traditions* of men in the *Worſhip* of God, ſhould be the greateſt upholders of that *Babyloniſh* Building.

But what ſhall we ſay? *The Carpenter encourageth the Goldſmith, Iſai.* 41. 7. and it ſeems Gods time is not yet come, when *Babylon* the Great ſhall be thrown as a Mill-ſtone into the Sea, and riſe no more. But Sir, in the mean time, what way is there left, but for Chriſtians diligently to ſearch the Scriptures, to pray for the Holy Spirit, (the promiſe of the Father) and wherein they differ, modeſtly to examine the Opinions of one another, and where God reveals more light, to endeavour to convince their Brethren, with a ſpirit of meekneſs, concealing the Infirmities, and covering the Imperfections of one another: But thoſe thunder-claps that came from you of late, make your Enemies to rejoyce, and your Friends mourn, and ſtanders by cannot hold their peace, but like *Cræſus* his dumb Son, are compelled to ſpeak, when they ſee the point of Infant-Baptiſm ſo provoke and enrage your Spirits

againſt a people, who practice the contrary, according to that light and knowledg they have received; and profeſs, they would be convinced, did they ſee any ſolid Arguments from the Scriptures: in the mean time, it ſeems they muſt be expoſed to all the calumnies and reproaches a numerous and prevailing party of their Opponents can caſt upon them.

But (Brethren) is not the Devil our common Enemy? and ſurely could we unite amongſt our ſelves, his Kingdom ſhould ſoon be divided; and then, and not till then, ſhall we ſee *Satan* fall like Lightning, and what glorious times might we then expect?

I deſire theſe Lines may be received in the ſame Spirit, and for the ſame end, for which they were Written, which was not to increaſe our Diviſions, but to allay them; for the effecting of which, we ſhall ſtill pray, and till God removes from us every thing that offends, and ſupplants every Plant that his own right hand hath not planted. Sir, I Reſt

Your Soul-Friend,

T. B.

BOOKS *Treating about the Subject of Baptiſm, Printed for, and Sold by* Francis Smith *at the* Elephant *and* Caſtle *near the* Royal Exchange *in* Cornhill.

A Treatiſe of *BAPTISM*, wherein that of Believers, and that of Infants, is examined by the Scriptures, with the Hiſtory of both out of Antiquity, making it appear that Infant-baptiſm was not practiſed for near 300 Years after Chriſt, nor enjoyned as neceſſary, till 400 Years after Chriſt, *&c.* With the Hiſtory of Chriſtianity amongſt the Ancient *Brittains* and *Waldenſians*, *&c.* By *H. D.*

Innocency and Truth vindicated; or, a Sober Reply to Mr. *Ws.* Anſwer; wherein the Authorities and Antiquities for Believers, and againſt Infant-Baptiſm, are defended; and the miſ-repreſentations and Forgeries he boaſts of, are returned upon himſelf. With a brief Anſwer to Mr. *Blinman's Eſſay*; by the ſame *Author.*

A *Second Reply* in Defence of the Treatiſe of Baptiſm, wherein Mr. *Baxter's More Proofs*, are found no Proof, in two parts; the Firſt defending the Antiquities againſt his charge of *Forgery.* The Second, juſtifying the charge of Slander, Contradiction, and Popery, againſt his Writings: As alſo an Admonition to Mr. *B.* by the ſame Author; and ſome Reflections by Mr. *Tombs* upon Mr. *B's. More Proofs.*

With

With a Rejoynder to Mr. *W.* his *Vindiciæ*, and an Anſwer to his *Appeal*; by the ſame Author. Together with the *Baptiſts* Anſwer to the ſaid Appeal.

The Book-ſeller further ſignifies to the Impartial Reader, deſiring information into that Principle of Baptizing Believers, that he can furniſh him with

The Learned Treatiſes of Mr. *John Tombs.*

The Works of Mr. *Samuel Fiſher*, in Folio.

A Pious and Learned Piece, by *Henry Lawrence*, Eſq;

A judicious Piece, by Mr. *Chriſtopher Blackwood*, Intituled the *Storming of Antichriſt*, *&c.*

ERRATA.

Candid Reader, Literal Eſcapes and Miſ-pointings are left to thine Ingenuity to Correct or Pardon; the moſt material Errors, correct thus: Laſt *page* of the Preface, *line* 20. after endeavours, read *to remove the abſurdities charged upon their practice and.* *p.* 3. *l.* 9. r. *never.* *p.*8.*l.*2. dele *thereby.* *l.*29. r.*legitur.* *p.*12.*l.*29. r. *lotus.* *p.*13.*l.*4.r. *illuſorium.* *p.*18.*l.*2. for *there* r.*that.* *p.* 19.*l.*1.r.*included.* *p.*22.*l.*10. dele *not.* There ſhould be a *ſpiritus aſper* over ſome *Greek* words, which thou wilt note.

My son give me mi[illegible]

and let thine eyes

ok

James Foster

Candid
Reader

James Can

James Cantor

Anne Hall is no
me

A TREATISE

Concerning the

COVENANT and BAPTISM

Dialogue-wise, between

a *BAPTIST* & a *POEDO-BAPTIST*,

Wherein is shewed,

That Believers only are the Spirituall Seed of *Abraham*; Fully discovering The Fallacy of the Argument drawn from the Birth Priviledge.

WITH

Some Animadversions upon a Book Intituled *Infant-Baptism from Heaven and not of men*, Defending the Practise of Baptizing only Believers against the Exceptions of M. *Whiston*.

By *Edward Hutchinson*.

Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ πρότερον εἶτα τῷ βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίσασθαι. &c. *It is necessary first to believe, and afterwards to be signed with Baptism.* Basil. *l.* 3. *contra Eunom.*

I beseech you regard not what this or that man says, but enquire all things of the Scripture, Chrysost. 13. hom. 2 Cor.

If you be Christs, then are ye Abrahams *seed, and heirs according to the Promise.* Gal. 3. 29.

LONDON,

Printed, for *Francis Smith* at the Elephant and Castle, near the *Royall Exchange* in *Cornhil*. 1676.

P Υ αυτον βιβλιον. 1786

His Book 173

A

TREATISE

concerning the

COVENANT and BAPTISM

Dialogue-wise, between

a BAPTIST & a PEDO-BAPTIST,

Wherein is shewn

That Believers only are the Spiritual Seed of Abraham; Fully discovering The Ground of the Arminian drawn from the Birth Privilege.

WITH

Some Animadversions upon a Book Intituled Infant Baptism from Heaven and not of men, Defending the Practice of Baptizing only Believers against the Exceptions of M. Walker.

By Edward Hutchings.

LONDON.

Printed for Francis Smith at the Elephant and Castle, near the Royal Exchange in Cornhill. 1676.

The Epistle
DEDICATORY.

To the spiritual seed of Abraham *especially those of the* Baptized *Congregations.*

BEloved *for the fathers sake, first premising, that they are not all* Israel, *that are of* Israel, *I know there is* drosse *mingled with your* silver, chaff *amongst your* wheat, *and the* Canaanite *is still in the land, and troubles you: but to you that are indeed the true seed of* Abraham *by faith in* Jesus Christ, *do I dedicate this Treatise. You beloved are of God, and have your fathers name written in your foreheads; you are the true* Israelites, *to whom pertaineth the* Adoption, *and the* glory, *the* Covenants *and Gospel* promises; *whose are the fathers, and for whom Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever. You are a chosen* generation, a Royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, walking in the steps of your father Abraham, *hearkning to that great* Prophet *whom God hath raised up among your brethren, and have been* baptized into the name of the father, son, and holy spirit. *But the* devil (*that implacable enemy of souls*) *hath endeavoured to wreak his malice upon you above all people, opening his floodgates to overwhelm you; the* Archers *have shot sorely at you, the* plowers *have made deep furrows upon your backs, yet you are still supported by the* rock *of Ages, and strengthned by an Everlasting* Arm; *they have*

laboured in vain, for the blessings of your father Abraham *have prevailed above the blessings of your progenitors.*

Your begining in these nations (of late years) was but small; yet when it pleased the Lord to dispel those clouds that overshaddowed us, and scatter some beams of the Gospel amongst us, he gave you so great an increase that Sion *may say with admiration,* who hath begotten me these! *&c.*

Nor is it lesse observable that whereas other Reformations have been carryed on by the secular arm, *and the Countenance and allowance of the Magistrate, as in* Luthers *time by several* German *Princes; the* Protestant *Reformation in* England *by King* Edward, Q. Elizabeth, *&c. The* Presbyterian *reformation, by a* Parliament, Comittee of Estates, Assembly of Divines, *besides the favour and assistance of great personages; you have had none of these to take you by the hand, but your progresse was against the impetuous current of humane opposition, attended with such external discouragements as bespeak your embracing this despised truth, an effect of heart-sincerity, void of all mercenary considerations. Yea how active has the* Accuser *of the Brethren been to represent you in such frightful figures, exposing you by that mischievous artifice to popular* Odium, *and the lash of Magistracy; in so much that the name of an* Anabaptist *was crime enough: which doubtlesse was a heavy* obstacle *in the way of many pious souls.*

And what our dissenting brethren have to answer upon that account (who instead of taking up, did stumbling blocks *in the way of Reformation)*

formation) *will appear another day. Yet notwithſtanding the ſtrenuous oppoſitions of thoſe great and learned ones, The mighty God of* Jacob *hath taken you by the hand, and ſaid* be ſtrong.

Beſides it has a conſiderable tendency to the advancement of divine grace, if we conſider the way and manner of the Reviving this coſtly truth. When the profeſſors of theſe Nations had been a long time wearied with the yoke of ſuperſtitious ceremonies, traditions of men, and corrupt mixtures in the worſhip and ſervice of God; *it pleaſed the Lord to break theſe yokes, and by a very ſtrong impulſe of his ſpirit upon the hearts of his people, to convince them of the neceſſity of Reformation. Divers pious and very gracious people having often ſought the Lord by faſting and prayer, that he would ſhew them the* patern of his houſe, *the goings out, and comings in thereof*, &c. *Reſolved* (*by the grace of God*) not to receive or practiſe any piece of poſitive worſhip, which had not precept or Example from the word of God. *Infant-Baptiſm coming of courſe under conſideration, after long ſearch and many debates it was found to have no footing in the Scriptures* (the only rule and ſtandard to try doctrines by) *but on the contrary a meer innovation, yea the prophanation of an ordinance of God. And though it was purpoſed to be laid aſide, yet what fears, tremblings, and temptations did attend them leſt they ſhould be miſtaken, conſidering how many learned and Godly men were of an oppoſite perſwaſion: How gladly would they have had the reſt of their brethren gone along with them? But when there was no hopes, they concluded that* a Chriſtians

ans faith muſt not ſtand in the wiſdom of men, and that every one muſt give an account of himſelf to God, *and ſo reſolved to practiſe according to their light, The great objection was, the want of an* Adminiſtrator, *which (as I have heard) was removed by ſending certain meſſengers to* Holland *whence they were ſupplyed. So that this little cloud of Witneſſes, hath the Lord by his grace ſo greatly encreaſed, that it is ſpread over our Horizon, though oppoſed and contradicted by men of all ſorts.*

And now friends I can ſafely bear you record, that it is not humour, conceitedneſſe *or* ſingularity (*ſo often charged upon you*) *that makes you decline the Baptizing your little ones: For I know they are as dear to you, as children are to any parents under heaven; your ſighs and tears, thoſe heart-breaking deſires and pathetick wiſhes you ſend to the mercy-ſeat for them, is a ſufficient teſtimony hereof, and your petitions, that* Iſhmael *may live before God, that your children may be converted, that they may have an Intereſt in the new Covenant, that the law of God may be written in their hearts, that their ſins may be pardoned, their natures ſanctifyed, and their ſouls eternally ſaved. And did you know that Baptiſm could contribute the leaſt* iota *hereunto, how readily and zealouſly would you perform it? beſides it is an eaſy ſervice, that would bring you into the credit and eſteem of differing profeſſors, divers of your natural relations, &c. yea 'tis as ſafe, as eaſy, nothing of* ſelf-denyal *or the* Croſs *attending it. And it is very remarkable that many have ſuffered for owning moſt (if not all other) points of faith and Chriſtianity, yea divers have ſuffered e-*

ven

yea unto death for denying, yet none (that ever I heard of) suffered for owning Infants-Baptism.

Yet though your children are dear to you, the word of the Lord, and the purity of his worship is far more dear, and hence you dare not adde to his words lest he reprove you, and you be found lyars. You dare not offer strange fire to the Lord, which he hath not commanded, nor prophane an Ordinance; you know that Baptism (being a part of instituted worship, not found in natures garden) has of it self no vertue, but what it receives from the instituter. For as one well observes moral laws are good, and therefore commanded; but positive worship is commanded, and therefore good. So that your adversaries clamour without ground, and the Lord will judge between us. And if it be questioned why I insist so much upon this subject? I answer, I was weary with forbearing when I saw your affliction, and beheld the reproaches, wherewith your opponents unmercifully persecute you. But brethren as I have gone in and out among you these six and twenty years, so I have had opportunity to know those pious souls among you, whose Conversation is in Heaven, who live above the Clouds, who groan under the body of sin, and remains of corruption, I have known your manner of life, your faith, patience, long-suffering, charity; I have also seen your dark side, and observ'd your infirmities (which your adversaries view through a multiplying glass;) But if there be any society or Community of people that differ from you, that have not their dark side, let them cast the first stone. Yet you dare not allow the least sin in you; your prayers and endeavours for

greater

4. *Whether it be Ingenuous or Honeſt to ſupply the want of Argument with ſuch phraſes as theſe*, proceeding from Immodeſty to Impudence. Warning his Reader to be wary of crediting any of his (*viz.* Mr. *Danver's*) perſwaſion, can any man think he had any true actual Fear of God before his Eyes. Down-right Falſities, Forgeries, meer Cheats, *&c. though not the leaſt Tittle of them proved to be juſtly chargeable upon Mr.* Danvers.

And to all which, I think (as it is the product of an Unruly provoking Spirit, actuated by prejudice, and its ireful concomitants) the beſt return will be ſilence. Let him conſider Gal. 6. 1. Mat. 5. 5.

We ſhall not Inſiſt upon his uncomely carriage throughout the whole Book, we leave it to his cooler conſideration, and the Reader's Obſervation, and ſhall preſent you with a brief account of his Book, and then Select what wants our Reply, and leave all to the judgment of the Reader.

The Book conſiſts of Two parts; 1. An attempt to weaken the Humane Authority urged by Mr. *Danvers* for Illuſtration of Believers Baptiſm, in oppoſition to Infants Baptiſm. 2. To Confute him in the Doctrinal part.

About

About the first he spends 24 pages; his Objections are some scraps of what Mr. B. *and Mr.*W. *have more at large urged, and already Answered by Mr.*D. *of which nevertheless I shall anon take a brief View.*

From p. 25. *to* 71. *he goes about to disprove* that Believers Baptism is only Christ's Baptism. 2. *To prove* that the silence of the Scripture about Infant-Baptism tends more to its establishment than overthrow. 3. To vindicate Tradition, as he defines it, *viz.* the Discoveries made by the Church Doctrinally and Practically from the Apostles time to us, as a subordinate means whereby we come to know, and are more fully confirmed what's contained in the Doctrine of the Apostles. 4. From *page* 71. *to* 129. *he* considers the Arguments from the Covenant, and Fœderal Holiness. 5. *From page* 129. *to the end, He* endeavours to prove the Validity of Baptism, as Administred by Sprinkling. *Of which in Order.*

ANIMADVERSIONS UPON Mr. *Whiſton*'s Book, &c.

HE Intitles his Book, *Infant Baptiſm from Heaven and not of Men*: This indeed may raiſe the *Expectation* of ſuch as have not Read Mr. *Baxter's Plain Scripture proof.* I began to think he had lighted upon ſome *Rarity*, elſe he would not Front his Book with ſuch a Title, nor trouble the World eſpecially at this juncture, when ſuch men of *Noiſe* are already Engaged againſt us. But *Empty* Caſks give the greateſt ſound, and pregnant Mountains bring forth a Mouſe. *From Heaven?* and has he been there then, and ſearcht the *Records*, and was of the *Cabinet-Counſel* of the Almighty? what if we doubt it? we have but his bare word for it. He muſt pardon me if I ſay *Infant-Baptiſm from* (Rome *or*) *beneath*; for if it had been of Heavens making, the Scriptures (*and the Records, and Hiſtories of the pureſt Primitive times*) would not be ſo ſilent about it, as the moſt Learned *Pædo-baptiſts* confeſs, and particularly Mr. *B.* our keeneſt Adverſary is forced to own they are. But the Author is cunning, and would Decoy the *Reader* by a ſpecious Title; ſo the Vintners gaudy ſign often Trapans to a coſtly (though unwholſome) Entertainment. The plain *Scripture-proof man* himſelf confeſſes *Infants baptiſm has its conſiderable*

siderable difficulties; the Ingenious Papist counts it *a Miracle to have it proved by Scripture*. Most of the Learned *Pædo-baptists* have recourse to *Tradition* for help, and how come they to miss of this mans Invention all this while? This *Apollo*, this *Oepidus*, this *Alexander* which you will, might have done good service to unriddle the *Ænigma*, or cut that knot, the unfolding of which cost so much Debate. Had he brought that from Heaven sooner, (which was ever there) he had saved many Learned men the labour of their Elaborate Systems *pro* and *con*. But this *Author* has as dexterous and nimble a way of confuting all *Antiquity*, as the Junior Sophister in *Oxford* used with *Bellarmine*, when he writ in the end of his Works, *Bellamine thou liest*; therefore I will make bold to tell him that he stamps his *uncertain* Conjectures with a Divine *Character*, and fathers his Forgeries and contrivances upon *Heaven*; which is a daring piece of Confidence, to say no more. So that I shall say of him, and from just ground, as the Poet of *Pigmalion*, extreamly doting upon the fair Image he made; *Operisq; sui concepit amorem*, *&c.*

He tells us, Mr. *Danvers his Book is all Forgery, which he leaves to the Readers Observation, wishing him to have a care of crediting any of his perswasion.* But if this be not Inconsistent with the Laws of *Ingenuity*, *Equity*, and the *Generosity* of a Scholastick Education, I know not what is. Had he been as nimble to attacque the Cause we maintain, as we find him a keen Satyrist against the persoa he Opposes, who never gave him the least Provocation; it would be more honest and taking. But instead of a fair *unprejudiced* Examination of our Arguments, he lays a-

bout him terribly, and deals his ſtrokes unmercifully, charges the whole with *Forgery*, *Falſhood*, and what not? without vouchſafing to tell us wherein thoſe Forgeries and Falſhoods lye. [But ſtay Sir, as lofty a conceit as you have of your ſelf, wee'll not believe you upon your bare word. Have you hit upon that pernicious Knack of aſſaſſinating mens credit at a breath? It ſeems you ſcorn to be ſuch a *petty Chapman* as Mr. *Ws.* (who comes to Particulars, but) you would knock us down by whole Sale. You leave the Reader *to his own obſervation.* And is that all? as if he had ſtood gaping till you become his *Monitor*, could not the Reader make his Obſervations without this impertinent *memento?*]

Be *wary of crediting any of his perſwaſion.*] In this I would appeal to *Mr. Whiſton's* Conſcience, or any man of common ingenuity, whether it be juſt and honeſt for him to charge the whole party of *Anti-pædo-baptiſts* at this rate, although Collonel *Danvers*, (as 'tis poſſible a Learned man may) had been miſtaken in ſome things among ſo numerous a Tract of *Quotations*? of which he has made no ſignificant diſcovery neither.) Would he think it fair dealing, if we ſhould improve the particular errors or miſcarriages of *Pædo Baptiſts* to the ſcandal of all under that denomination? particularly the apparent Injuſtice, and unchriſtian Dealings of Mr. B. and *Mr. Ws.* in their late conſpiracy, wrongfully to impeach us, and the truth we profeſs; and their malicious Contrivances in proſecution thereof, fully detected by another hand.

And whether we have not juſt ground to conclude his *Infant-baptiſm is not from Heaven*, not only from the weakneſs of his Arguments, but from his manner

of

of Arguing alſo? the Apoſtles way being to convince in meekneſs, and confute in terms full of Love, and void of all Opprobrious and Canting Railery. The Scripture tells us, that *the wiſdom that is from Above, is firſt pure, then peaceable, gentle, and eaſie to be intreated, full of mercy and good Works, without partiality, and without Hypocriſie, James* 3. 17. Whereas he accoſts us in ſo haughty and domineering an Equipage, as he thinks will cruſh and diſable us from any farther Encounters with ſo dreadful a *Gigas* as he takes himſelf to be. Expoſing us to the ſcorn and odium of the whole World, as if we had not felt enough of its unkindneſs, till he comes to open the mouth of *Calumny* wider, and make our Enemies baul louder. But theſe things we hope our Lord God, whom we deſire to ſerve, will give us patience to *endure* for his Name and Truths ſake.

But to put the better face upon the matter, he pretends to give ſome inſtances of *Mr. Ds.* his *unfaithfulneſs* in his Quotations, and of a great many picks out two (with ſingular judgment) which he thinks he can toſs to the purpoſe, and makes his Reader ſport to ſee how ridiculous he would make them. But to check his triumphant Inſultings, we ſhall joyn iſſue with him in the fair Tryal of thoſe particulars he impeaches.

1. He charges Collonel *Danvers* for unfaithfulneſs in affirming that *the Magdeburgs* ſay in the place he cites, *That in the firſt Century, they find they baptized only the Adult or Aged, &c. whereas the Word only is not there.* This Exception *Mr. Ws.* made, and is anſwered by *Mr. D.* in *p.* 31, 32. of his *Reply*, and I conceive it is no part of ingennity in *Mr. Whiſton* to be inculcating that which he could not be ignorant was

ſo juſtly replyed to already. But

What if Mr. *D.* has been in the *right*, and the *falſhood* be laid at *Mr. Whiſtons* door? is not *Mr. Whiſton* then the unfaithful man? and that it is ſo, the Reader is deſired to conſider, that what we deſire to prove from the *Magdeburgs* is matter of Fact, *viz.* whether Infants were Baptized in that Age, which in plain terms they tell us they read no Example of, *Exempla annotata non leguntur*; and that the Adult of *Jew* and *Gentile* were Baptized, as is exemplified *Acts* 2. 8,10,16,19,*&c.* and is not this Equivalent with what he alleges, *viz.* that they Baptized only the Adult, finding examples for the one, and not for the other; any man in his ſences may ſee that there is no more difference between them, than there is between two ſix pences and a ſhilling. We confeſs the *Magdeburgs* were for Infant-Baptiſm, and that they cite *Origen* and *Cyprian* as Authors, that it was an Apoſtolical Tradition, in theſe words, *Sed* Origines *&* Cyprianus *&* *alii Patres Authores ſunt Apoſtolorum etiam tempore baptizatos eſſe*; Conſtat *enim hoc ex Apoſtolorum Scriptis quod Infantes a Baptiſmo non excludant, nam dum Circumciſionis locum Baptiſmum ſupplere* Paulus *docet*, Col. 2. *Æque Infantes atque Adultos ad Baptiſmum admittendos judicat*; that is, Origen *and* Cyprian, *and other Fathers, tell us, that in the Apoſtles time ſome were Baptized; for this is evident from the Apoſtles Writings, that they did not exclude Infants from Baptiſm, and where* Paul *teaches*, Col. 2. *that Baptiſm ſucceeds in the place of Circumciſion*, he declares *that Infants as well as the Adult are to be admitted to Baptiſm.*

The Reader is deſired to note how Craftily Mr. *Whiſton* ſtops in his Quotation at the words *Conſtat*

ex

ex Apostolorum Scriptis, i. e. it is *evident from the Apostles Writings*, to make the Reader believe they mean it (that Infants were Baptized,) whereas it relates to the following part of the sentence, *viz.* (*Quod Infantes a baptismo non excludant*, *that they did not exclude Infants from Baptism*, rendring himself guilty of what he unjustly accuses Mr. *D.* But to the Quotation:

Wherein we have Three Things urged by them as Arguments for their practice; First the Testimony of *Origen* and *Cyprian* Secondly, Arguments from Infants non exclusion from Baptism in Scriptures. Thirdly, an Inference to prove it lawful, as succeeding Circumcision.

1. The Testimony of *Origen* and *Cyprian*, this I shall say little to, being substantially enervated by *Mr. Danvers* already in his *Rejoynder*, where it is made out, (1.) that *Origen* and *Cyprian* say no such thing, (2.) that if they had, its no great matter; the Books being from just grounds judged spurious: (3.) that if the Books were genuine, their Testimonies in the *Third Century* is not sufficient to prove matter of *Fact* the First Age.

2. The Arguments from Infants non Exclusion being *Mr. Whiston's* dear Argument so oft repeated, and made such a flourish withall, and filling a good part of his Book, our Answer shall be refered to the place where he urges it.

3. The Inference from Circumcision; this *Mr. Whiston* in expres terms tells us, is not made any ground of Infant Baptism by them in these words, We plead not for Infants Baptism, meerly from the Analogy it bears to Circumcision (and is angry they should be charged with it, (though his practice contradicts

the expreſſion very often, as well as the *Mageburgs* thereby) therefore I ſhall not ſpend time to diſprove that which he owns not. The Second Inſtance he gives of *Mr. Ds.* unfaithfulneſs, is, *page 7. Mr. D.* ſayes thus: As to Baptiſm in the *Second Century*, they ſay *Cent. 2. cap. 6. p.* 109. that it doth not appear by any approved Author that there was any Variation or Mutation from the former, *Which Mr.* Whiſton is angry for, and ſayes, *Mr. D. would make people believe he ſpake this of the ſubject of baptiſm, whereas it is of the Rites and Ceremonies.*

I have Examined what *Mr. Danvers* ſayes, and that *Century*, and I find that he mentions neither ſubject nor rite, but only cites their words, and applies it as fairly; their words are, *Simplicem baptizandi formam fuiſſe retentam ex eo apparet, quod in probatis autoribus nulla inſignis reperitur variatio aut mutatio annotata. It is apparent that the ſimple (or old) form of baptizing was kept (viz.* in the *Second Age*) becauſe no remarkable Variation or Mutation is noted by any approved Author, and that this comprehends both the ſubject and way of Adminiſtration of the firſt Age, is evident to ſuch as are not critically contumacious and blind; and it is very probable, yea certain, that had the *Magdeburg's* found any Example for Infant-Baptiſm in this Age more than in the former, they would not fail to mention it; and though they ſay, *Nec uſquam legiter Infantes hoc ſæculo remotos eſſe, that we read not of Infants being excluded in this Age*, we may as truly ſay, *Nec uſquam legitur Infantes hoc ſæculo baptizari; We read of no Infants baptized in this Age*: So that it is a ſure Argument the thing was not in being, becauſe no mention is made of it, as practiced or not

practiced

practiced. I have read the Story of the *Jew*, which he upbraids Collonel *D.* for over-looking, *who like to dye, was upon his earneſt requeſt baptized* (as they call it) *by his fellow Travellers, by flinging Sand upon him, there being no poſſibility of having Water there.* But what advantage this makes for *Mr. Whiſton*, we know not, let him make the beſt of it; if he had thought it ſo much for his purpoſe, why did not he mention it? but he choſes rather to make the Reader believe there is ſomething in it for his advantage, when indeed it ſignifies nothing for him.

The Second thing he remarks, is the impertinency of his proofs, and of which he gives Five Inſtances, how proper we are now to enquire. But firſt, Is it not unjuſt for *Mr. Whiſton* to charge his Adverſary with that Crime whereof he himſelf is notoriouſly guilty; as I could inſtance if I would be impertinent, and for a taſt will begg the Readers pardon to remark one. Is it to *Mr Whiſton's* purpoſe, or does the Argument he manages require it, that he ſhould publiſh in print (firſt part of his Infant-Baptiſm) *that he is a Batchelor, &c.* is the World concerned in the changes of his ſtate? or does he think that by the Charms of his Wit and Oratory, ſome great *Cometiſſa* will fall in Love with him? Is not that as impertinent a Proclamation as the *Eccleſiaſtical Politician's* publiſhing his *dull and lazy diſtemper*? I would not have ſaid this, but to ſhew how he that's ſo nimble to fall upon others in print, ſhould take care firſt to amend himſelf.

And as to his Exceptions under this head, they are indeed ſo frivolous and inſignificant, that it is in vain to ſpend time to refute that which any Reader may do in the very peruſing; for what does he more than

than pick up ſome ſcrips here and there, pickeering at a part as the preamble (or that that makes way) to the main thing, wherein all the *force* is put, and to which theſe paſſiges he ſnatches up may be only Circumſtantial. So that *Mr. Whiſton* beats the Ayre, and fights manfully with a *Figment* of his own brain. For,

1. The piece of the *Waldenſian* Confeſſion, which he ſayes *is not to our purpoſe*, is but an Introduction to the *7th. Article* in the ſame page, which ſayes, *That by baptiſm we are received into the Holy Congregation of the people of God, declaring openly our Faith, &c.* which our Anſwerer takes no notice of.

That of *Vignier* is pertinently enough brought, wherein the *Waldenſes reject all Doctrines which have not their foundation in Scripture, and all Ceremonies and* Romiſh *Traditions*; becauſe the Baptiſm of Infants at that time was practiced from that ground. And that he gives a teſtimonial of them, that they denyed Infants Baptiſm *in totidem Verbis*; See what he ſayes, (*viz. Nicholas Vignier* in his Book called *la Vraye Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, p. 354. upon the year 1136. ſpeaking of the *Waldenſes* and ſome of their principal Barbs, where he hath theſe words, *Et qu'ils condamnoient le Bapteſme de Petits Enfans alleguans que le Bapteſme n'aportoient qu' a ceux qui ont foi. i. e. And they condemned the Baptizing of little Infants, alledging that Baptiſm belongs to none but thoſe that have Faith.*

As to the agreement between the *Donatiſts* and *Novations*; it is alſo properly enough applyed, for all *Mr. Whiſton's* haſt, as the following words of *Mr. Ds.* make out, *viz.* they held, *That none ought to be received into Churches, but ſuch as were viſibly true Be-*

lie-

fevers, and read Saints, &c. The way of being received into the Church, Mr. *W.* knows to be Baptiſm, but he overlooks this alſo.

As to the Three other Particulars out of the *Waldenſian Confeſſions*, p. 282, 283, 284. 1 *Ed.* he Excepts againſt, as not to our purpoſe, let the ſame return ſerve them as before.

That out of *Thuanus* from Dr. *Uſher*, viz. *that the* Beringarians *held that Baptiſm did not profit Children to Salvation* is a proper and ſuitable Argument of their denying Infant Baptiſm, it being elſewhere evidenced (and which *Mr. Whiſton* nor his Aſſociates never Anſwered) that that was the only ground of its adminiſtration, *viz.* that it Saved the Child's Soul.

3. As to his Charge of *Mr. Ds. perverting Authors* ſayings, viz. *Pædo-baptiſts in general*, it is already fully cleared by himſelf in his *Rejoynder* to *Mr. Ws.* and to him the Reader is referred. 2. *Mr. Whiſton* would have us ſhew, *wherein lyes the inconſiſtency of their words with their practice*; which is alſo fully done. But me thinks it might be a properer task for themſelves to reconcile their *Contradictions*, which they are loudly called to do, if they can; and ſo either yield up the Cauſe, or remove the ſtumbling *blocks* they themſelves lay in our way.

4. He ſays, *Some of Mr. Ds. Authorities are againſt himſelf*, and inſtances *Mr. Baxter*, (we confeſs he is ſometimes againſt us to the purpoſe, but ſometimes he is alſo kind enough, and gave us Twenty good Arguments improved by *Mr. Tombs* in his *Felo de Se.*) But for the reſt 'tis but meer prattle. *Chryſoſtom* is inſtanced, to ſhew the Erroneous ground upon which Infant-Baptiſm was practiced, *viz.* to take away

away Original Sin; and if it be a proof for *Mr. Whiſton*, let him take it, I'll give him another proof too if that will pleaſe him out of his Friend *Auſtin*; 23 *Epiſt.* ad Bonif. *Nec illud te moveat, quod quidam non ea fide ad Baptiſmum præcipiendum parvulos ferunt, ut gratia ſpirituali ad vitam regenerentur Æternam, ſed quod eos putant hoc remedio temporalem retinere, ac recipere ſanitatem, non enim propterea illi non regenerantur, quia non ab illis hac intentione offeruntur, celebrantur enim per eos neceſſaria Miniſteria.* But he muſt excuſe me if I leave him the pleaſure of Tranſlating it, ſeeing he may perhaps do it to moſt advantage.

That *Peter Bruis* and *Henricus* denyed Infants Baptiſm, we have good ground to believe from many ſubſtantial Reaſons offered by *Mr.* D. and if we reject the teſtimony of *Papiſts* (in whoſe hands moſt of our ancient Writings have been for ſome Centuries, which we are well enough ſatisfied to do) in this, why not in other things?

That *Cluniacenſis* (owned to be a very learned man) diſputed with *Peter Bruis*, and *Henry*, is evident; he layes down their Poſition to be this:

Nos vero tempus congruum fidei expectamus, & hominem poſtquam Deum ſuum cognoſcere, & in eum credere paratus eſt, non ut nobis imponitis, Rebaptizamus ſed Baptizamus, quia nunquam baptizatus dicendus eſt, qui baptiſmo quo lavantur peccata, locus non eſt. i. e. *We wait for the fit ſeaſon of Faith, and when a man knows his God, and believes in him, we baptize him, not rebaptize as you charge us; for he cannot be ſaid to be ever baptized, that is not waſht with the baptiſm that waſheth away ſins.* And then makes this pathetick declamation againſt them, enumerating

ting

ting the Abſurdities he fancies that follow their Opinion; he ſaith thus: *Itane deſipuere prætrita ſæcula, & tot millibus parvulorum per mille & eo amplus annos illuſorum baptiſma tribuerent, &c.* which I thus Engliſh.

And have paſt Ages been ſo fooliſh, and have given but a mock-baptiſm to ſo many thouſand Little ones, for this thouſand years and more, and from Chriſts time to ours have made them not real, but fantaſtick (or imaginary) Chriſtians? Was the whole World ſo blinded and involved in ſo huge a miſt of darkneſs hitherto, that it muſt wait for you at length to open its eyes, and to diſpel ſo tedious a Night, that after ſo many Fathers, Martyrs, Popes, *and* Princes *of the Univerſal Churches, it muſt chuſe* Peter Bruis *and* Henry *his Lackey as the laſt Apoſtles to correct its long error? What hath all the World periſhed till the coming of theſe New Reformers of our Age, and have all things been managed by the Sons of Light and Truth in darkneſs and falſhood, that whereas all of any Age or Rank having been baptized in Infancy, and received their Chriſtian name then, and in convenient time have been preferred in divers degrees in the Church, no* Biſhop *of the Biſhops, no* Prieſt, *no* Deacon, *no* Clerk, *no* Monk, *not one as I may ſay of thoſe innumerable number, will be a Chriſtian? for whoſoever is not baptized with the Baptiſm of Chriſt, hath not Chriſt, nor can he be of the Clergy, People, or Church And if it be ſo, what manifeſt abſurdities will follow. For whereas all* France, Spain, Germany, Italy, *and all* Europe *for almoſt three hundred or four hundred years, have none baptized but in Infancy, they have therefore no Chriſtian, if no Chriſtian, then no Church; if no Church, no Chriſt; and if no Chriſt, then certainly they are damned. Our Fathers therefore have*

have perished, because they could not be baptized with Christs baptism in their Infancy; And we that live shall also perish, unless after Christs Baptism we be Baptized with Henries Baptism also. *And innumerable of the Saints shall be pluck'd down from Heaven to the Infernal Seats, whom though baptized in Infancy, their life by its Holiness, the World by its testimony, and Divinity by Miracles have made famous; they must be made the Collegues of Devils, who were the Companions of Angels; and they that through their pious Labours are arrived to Eternal life, will suddenly be flung into everlasting death. Our Holy dayes shall be turned to mourning, our Sabboths into shame, and our Honour into nothing. Who can bear these? who can hear it? who would not shut his ears, and with all those they labour to damn, would not rise against these Arch Hereticks? But come unto me, and repent of so great a Prodigie. You scorn and deride* that one should be Saved by the Faith of another, *denying it with great Mockery among the Rusticks and unlearned Multitude.* A brutish and impious Heresie. *Petrus Cluniacensis, contrá Petro brusianos hæret.* p. 1124. Edit Paris 1614.

As to those late Authors, he sayes, whose testimonies *deserve no credit*, as to the first Ages, *viz. Willifrid, Strabo, Boemus, Lud. Vives.* I conceive however they are to be believed as soon as *Mr. Whiston.* And he that leans so much upon *Origen* and *Cyprian*, (though those Books Father'd upon them are judged spurious) to prove matter of Fact in the *First Age*, though they lived in the Third Century, should clear himself, before he falls foul upon others.

And Lastly, Since he declines all *Humane Authority*

rity as of no weight, ſo do we, and proceed to examine the Scripture grounds, which we deſire only to adhere to, and own it to be our Principle *to receive no Article of Faith, however entertain'd or cry'd up by Nations, Fathers, &c. that is not made Authentick by the Written Word of God.*

And whether Mr. *Danvers* (the Exceptions here made, being ſo few, and of ſo little weight) deſerves ſo ſevere a Caſtigation as this Author is pleaſed to give him, let the World judge.

And therefore we go on to try the oppoſition he makes as to the Doctrinal part. And firſt we affirm:

That *Believers Baptiſm is only Chriſt's Baptiſm*; which Mr. *Danvers* proved by the order laid down in the Commiſſion, *Matth.* 28. 19. to which Mr. *Whiſton* makes this demur; That *this Commiſſion doth not exclude Infants from Baptiſm, ſuppoſing their Baptiſm elſewhere in Scripture warranted.*

That this is a very ſorry Evaſion, will appear, if you conſider that this is the ſolemn Inſtitution and Commiſſion given to the Apoſtles, impowring them *to Preach the Goſpel, and Baptize*; and to charge it with darkneſs and imperfection (as Mr. *Whiſton* doth,) is to reflect upon the Law giver; and for us to obſerve any Order, but what is here laid down, is to go beyond our Commiſſion, and be wiſe above what is written. Which is not only our Opinion, but the great *Baſil*'s own words upon the place, ὁμως ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι, *&c. i. e.* But we think it neceſſary to have recourſe to the order preſcribed by the Lord, *viz.* firſt to Teach, then Baptize, *page* 636. *de Baptiſmo.*

2. It

2. It has been elſe-where ſufficiently proved that Infants (becauſe Unbelievers till Converted, *Eph.* 2. 3. and ſo uncapable of the qualification pre-required here) are excluded.

3. If it ſhould be urged that Infants have Faith (as ſeveral Learned *Pædo-baptiſts* affirm, though not ſo fortunate as to agree what kind of Faith, ſome being for a *Seminal*, ſome a *Federal*, ſome an *Imputative* Faith, *&c.* verifying the Proverb, *Tot capita, tot ſenſus,*) then we may conclude that there's no ſuch thing as Regeneration; for if we be Believers from the Womb, where is there any room for the New Birth? and if that be once admitted, the whole ſcope and frame of the Goſpel is ſubverted; for it would be an abſurd Errand to call ſuch to Believe, who are Believers by a Birth-privilege, and in a ſtate of Regeneration as ſoon as Born. But common Experience confutes this Childiſh fancy. And for that diſtinction (ſome of them make) of Faith in *actu primo*, or Potential Faith not yet grown up to actual, were it admitted (for which there is no Reaſon, the Maxim being juſt and ſafe, *Ubi lex non diſtinguit, non eſt diſtinguendum*; *where the Law diſtinguiſhes not, we muſt not diſtinguiſh,*) yet it would not ſerve the turn, ſince Unbelievers Children may be as truly ſaid to have Faith in *Actu primo*, or potentially, as Believers Children, they proving frequently Converts, and precious Saints, whilſt Believers Children often run the broad way of Wickedneſs. Beſides if Children had ſuch a Faith, and that the diſtinction were (as it is not) good, it would not be enough, becauſe *no Faith but an actual perſonal Faith qualifies for Baptiſm.*

But

But he sayes, *Supposing their Baptism elsewhere warranted in Scripture.*] But why is not that Scripture produced? 'tis much talk'd of, but we can never see it: which makes us conclude, that men that are so nimble to press Scriptures into their service, that not a whit be-friend their Cause, if they could hit upon any such plain Text, would be brisk enough to bring it forth. But alas! if they had their Warrant from Scripture, they would not take such pains to prove *that the silence of the Scripture is such an Argument to evince the lawfulness of their practice* [a very mad and wild way of reasoning] nor run to the beginning of the World, to find some protection for it among the *Jewish* Rites. Gospel Ordinances must be evidenced by Gospel Authority. What institution of the New Testament but is plainly to be proved by New-Testament Scripture? Must Baptism alone (though so plainly, yea in words at length, both as to subject and form of Administration there instituted) be beholden to *Circumcision*, *Gen.* 17. 7. for its Original? though as different and remote from it as the *Gospel* is from the *Law*; If so, Why are not the Baptized Infants now admitted to the priviledges the Circumcised were of old? *viz.* to be Members of the *Church* now, as they were then of the *Common-wealth*; to come to the *Supper*, as they to the *Passeover*, *&c.* this Riddle we desire may be unfolded.

But he goes on in the same Tune, and tells us, *that as here is no express mention of Infants* (that's well granted) *so no word, phrase, or clause, that can be rationally interpreted to exclude them.*]

No more is there any word, phrase, or clause excluding *Unbelievers* Children, nay which is more, not so much as a word, phrase, or clause that (literally)

excludes *Bells, Church walls, Standards, &c.* from Baptism; and if the'r be ground enough for this Author to Baptize them, let him take the Honor of the Employment.

He sayes, *Christ may have given this Commission only with reference to the Adult*, that we believe and contend for; and 'tis now happily granted us,) *and may have sufficiently declared his will concerning the Baptism of Infants in other parts of his Word*; that's the thing he should prove, and that other part of his Word; if he knows it, he should direct us to, and so end the Controversie. We have read the *Bible* over and over, and can find no such thing; we guess what he drives at, and believe hee'll settle at last in the Old shift of *Gen.* 17. 7. But when he comes there, we are prepared to encounter him.

He saies *page* 28. *'Tis not necessary that our Lord Christ should expresly declare his whole mind in any part of his Word, no not in the Commission it self, for the administration of them.* He would do well to forbear charging Christ with *Mental Reservations* in his Directions and Commissions to his APOSTLES. We think our selves concerned to obey that part of his will he is pleased to reveal to us, and that he exacts our Obedience no futher. And if Mr. *Whiston* durst do things in presumption, that they are that part of his *Will* he reveals not, so taking upon him to pry into the *Arcana* of God, we will not be of his Confederacy, nor Abettors to so desperate a piece of Arrogance. Hee'll find himself puzled to answer that Question, *who hath required these things at your hands?*

He proceeds, and would make us believe, *that the Commission, Mat.* 28. 19. *is so intricate and insufficient,*

ent, that nothing of the principal things therein excluded, can be made out by it; and the better to make the Reader out of conceit with it, propounds five or six Queſtions, whether to puzzle, or give us work, or ſhew his dexterity in quibbling, is not much to the matter. It is the diſcreſſion of Foxes to raiſe a duſt, that in the Obſcurity it makes, they may make an unobſerved retreat to their Hole, from the Huntſman's purſuit. Our *Author* has learnt that policy; his meaning is involved in a Labyrinth of Obſcurities, and inextricable Meanders.

1. He tells us, if we will believe him, *That it is not determinable by the Commiſſion, Whether the Nations were to be Diſciples by Teaching or Baptizing*; that this is an idle Criticiſm will appear to any Body that underſtands the meaning of the Verb μαθητευσατε, which is to make Diſciples by Teaching, (for Baptiſm cannot make one a Scholar,) and βαπτίζοντες, the participle of the preſent-tenſe holds forth, that immediatly upon their being made Diſciples by the Word, they are to be added to the Church by Baptiſm, which is the interpretation that's exemplified by the Apoſtles, *Acts* 2. 41.

2. *Who among the Nations to whom the Goſpel is preached, ought to be accounted Diſciples, and as ſuch the proper ſubjects of Baptiſm?* This he propoſes as a knotty point, but as Enigmatical as he would make it, we evidence the Juſtice of our practice by this Dilemma. Either Chriſt ſent them to Baptize all the World whether they will be Baptized or not, or ſuch only as receive their Doctrine: The former Mr. *Whiſton* will not, nor dares not avouch; therefore the latter anſwers his Queſtion. Beſides the Scripture plainly Reſolves it, (and that he cannot ſay of

his Infant Baptism for the dear sake of which, he makes this clutter,) when it tells us, *That they were such as gladly received the Word*, Act. 2. 41. *and such as professed they believed with all their hearts*, Act. 8. 37. &c.

3. *Whether the Nations were to be Baptized as Disciples, or as men?* the Resolution of the former may be enough for this also; the Text saies, (βαπτίζοντες,) *Baptizing*, but who? why certainly it must be (μαθητας,) *Disciples*, understood in the Verb μαθητεύσατε, which exactly agrees with the Apostles practice, (the best Comment upon the Text) And if you refer the Pronoun αὐτοὺς, to τὰ ἔθνη, (which is false *Syntax* too, unless you run for refuge to the figure *Synthesis*, which is, *Oratio congrua sensui non voci*) and so conclude that all the Nation whether Discipled or not, are Baptizable; 'tis evident you pervert the meaning of Christ, and would make up a Synagogue of *Heathens*, instead of a *Christian* Church.

4. *What the manner of Baptism is, whether to be administred by Dipping or Sprinkling?* this he saies is not determinable by the Commission.

But we affirm, and he cannot deny, that the Word *properly* and *natively* signifies to *dip*, or plunge under water; never to sprinkle; and therefore conclude it the safest way to keep to the proper meaning of the Word. If Sprinkling had been Christs way, he wanted not a fit expression for it: And if he and his party durst play the Critticks upon his words, and commit a Rape upon his very expressions, we durst not joyn with them in it.

5. *Whether only Males, or both Males and Females ought to be Baptized* αὐτοὺς, *being the Masculine gender?*

He might as well raise this scruple, whether Females are concerned in most Christian Duties, because the Words

words of the Text are addreſt to the Male kind, the Maſculine as the moſt worthy, comprehending the other Gender. Is a Woman excluded from the duty of *Self-examination*, becauſe the Pronoun ἑαυτὸν is in the Maſculine Gender, 1 *Cor.* 11.28. or from the duty to *abide in the Calling wherein unto ſhe is called*, becauſe ἕκαστος, (1 *Cor.* 7. 20.) is ſo? Doth not the Article οἱ reſpect both Man and Woman, οἱ δύο, they two ſhall be made one fleſh. And why we cannot be allowed the ſame liberty here, I know not.

Having raiſed this miſt, he thinks in the Obſcurity he has made about the Commiſſion, he might bring in Infant Sprinkling, that it may *lurk* there too, telling us that ſince theſe Particulars are as difficultly to be made out by the Commiſſion, as Infant-Baptiſm, he may have *recourſe to other Revelations* to evidence it.

Anſw. He might have had that liberty without making ſo Critical an Invaſion upon this grand *Commiſſion*. (2.) We take it as an inſtance of the unlikelihood of his producing any other *Revelation*, becauſe he tampers with the Commiſſion at that rate, and ſpins out time, never coming to any ſuch Revelation, wearying the Reader, with ſuch a Circuit and Maze of words, that he forgets the *beginning*, before he comes to the *end*. But (3*ly*.)

Let him from other Scriptures or Revelations make out, That Infant-Baptiſm is warranted in this Commiſſion as clearly and undeniably as we can Evidence, that *thoſe only ought to be Baptized* (in purſuance of it) *as gladly receive the word*, *Females*, as well as *Males* (being the thing he would make us believe are to indemonſtrable by it) and we ſhall ſubmit unto it; In the mean time, let him not take it ill, if we take no more notice of him, then of a man under a